STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Lutheran quarterly.
v.41 1911 Lutheran quarterly
0 0001 00658543 2

REFERENCE

COLLECTIONS

04-79-857-5

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol41lutheranqua00luth

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLI.

America, The Desirability and Possibility of a United Lutheran Church in, 229.
Assaults, The Most Recent, of the Higher Critical Theology on the Person of Christ, 474.
Bible, The, 361.
Bloody Sacrifice, The Pedagogic Value of, 403.
Braeuer, John R., M.Litt., Ph.D., Article by, 403.
Catechisation, Method in, 370.
Catechisation, Faithful, and its Results, 424.
Charge to Professor J. L. Neve, D.D., 117.
Christ, The Most Recent Assaults of the Higher Critical Theology on the Person of, 474.
Christ's Personal Presence, 533.
Church, The, and the Toiler, 1.
Confirmation, Benefits and Solemnity of, 208.
Conference, The Edinburgh World Missionary, 171.
Conference, A World, On Questios of Faith and Order, 165.
Confessional Basis, The Formulation of the General Synod's, 120.
Culler, Jacob Henry, D.D., Article by, 117.
Current Theological Thought, 140, 286, 437, 583.
Delk, Rev. Edwin Heyl, D.D., Articles by, 1, 556.
Departed Souls, The Present State of the, 53.
Dornblaser, Rev. T. F., D.D., Article by, 229.
Economic Questions, Luther and 387.
Education, Unification of Higher Lutheran, 350.
Edinburgh, The, World Missionary Conference, 171.
Eliot's, Dr., Religion of the Future, 30.
"Evolution Up-to-Date," 256.
Exposition of Lent, 540.
Faith, A World's Conference on Questions of, and Order, 165.
Faulkner, Prof. John Alfred, Article by, 387.
Feldman, Rev. W. H., Article by, 370.
Geesey, Rev. Fred. S., Article by, 53.
General Synod, Confessional Basis of, 120.
General Synod's, Formulation of the, Confessional Basis, 120.
General Synod, The "New Measure Movement" as a Factor in the Development of the, 505.
Genesis I, The Relation of, to the Following Chapters, 249.
God, Man's Relation to, 195.
Hankey, Rev. Upton A., D.D., Article by, 516.
Hantz, Prof. J. M., Article by, 195.
Hamsher, Rev. M. R., Article by, 208.
Illinois, The Lutheran Church in Southern, 412.
Individualism, 214.
Jacoby, Rev. J. C., D.D., Article by, 74.
Keyser, Rev. Leander S., D.D., Articles by, 282, 533.
Larimer, Prof. L. H., D.D., Article by, 245.
Lent, Exposition of, 540.
Lent, The Lutheran Usage of, 84.
Literature, Review of Recent, 152, 302, 455, 596.
Life, The, and Message of Tolstoi, 516.
Luther, and Economic Questions, 387.
Lutheran, The, Church in Southern Illinois, 412.

Lutheran Theology, Glimpses of Early, 61.
Lutheran Church in America, The Desirability and Possibility of a United, 229.
Lutheran, The, Usage of Lent, 84.
Lutheran, The, Doctrine of the Holy Sacrament, 74.
Lutheranism, The Antithesis of Romanism and, 15.
Lutheran Unity, Foreign Missions as a Working Basis for, 476.
Man's Relation to God, 195.
Marx, Karl, 556.
Memoir, A, Samuel Alfred Ort, 245.
Message, The Life and, of Tolstoi, 516.
Method in Catechisation, 370.
Missionary Conference, The Edinburgh World, 171.
Missions, Foreign, As a Working Basis for Lutheran Unity, 467.
Nature, Does, Make Progress? 282.
Neve, Prof. J. L., D.D., Article by, 120.
Neve, Prof. J. L., D.D., Charge to, 117.
"New Measure Movement," The, as a Factor in the Development of the General Synod, 505.
Ortlepp, E. E., D.D., Article by, 84.
Original Sin, 319.
Ort, Samuel Alfred, A Memoir, 245.
Order, A World's Conference on Questions of Faith and, 165.
Pepper, George Wharton, Esq., Article by, 165.
Personal Presence, Christ's, 533.
Potts, Rev. A. D., D.D., Ph.D., Article by, 540.
Pragmatism, 272.
Progress? Does Nature Make, 282.
"Religion of the Future," Dr. Eliot's, 30.
Ritualism, 574.
Romanism, The Antithesis of, and Lutheranism, 15.
Sacraments, The Lutheran Doctrine of the Holy, 74.
Scholl, Rev. George, D.D., Article by, 505.
Seidel, W. C., D.D., Article by, 424.
Sifferd, C. W., D.D., Article by, 412.
Sherck, Rev. C. Rollin, Article by, 256.
Sin, Original, 319.
Singmaster, Dr. J. A., Articles by, 140, 286, 437, 583.
Smith, Rev. Arthur, H., D.D., Article by, 15.
Stork, Theo. B., Esq., Article by, 272.
Stump, Adam, D.D., Article by, 30.
Super, Prof. Charles W., D.D., Article by, 214.
Theology, Glimpses of Early Lutheran, 61.
Theology, The Most Recent Assaults of the Higher Critical, on the Person of Christ, 474.
Toiler, The Church and the, 1.
Tolstoi, The Life and Message of, 516.
Tressler, Prof. V. G. A., D.D., Ph.D., Articles by, 61, 350, 474.
Unification of Higher Lutheran Education, 350.
United Lutheran Church, The Desirability and Possibility of a, in America, 229.
Unity, Foreign Missions as a Working Basis for Lutheran, 467.
Voigt, Prof. A. G., D.D., 249.
Wenner, Rev. George U., D.D., Articles by, 361, 574.
Wentz, Prof. A. R., Articles by, 143, 294, 444, 588.
Wolf, Rev. L. B., D.D., Articles by, 171, 319, 467.

PRESBYTERIAN
SEMINARY
LIBRARY

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLI.

America, The Desirability and Possibility of a United Lutheran Church in, 229.
Assaults, The Most Recent, of the Higher Critical Theology on the Person of Christ, 474.
Bible, The, 361.
Bloody Sacrifice, The Pedagogic Value of, 403.
Braeuer, John R., M.Litt., Ph.D., Article by, 403.
Catechisation, Method in, 370.
Catechisation, Faithful, and its Results, 424.
Charge to Professor J. L. Neve, D.D., 117.
Christ, The Most Recent Assaults of the Higher Critical Theology on the Person of, 474.
Christ's Personal Presence, 533.
Church, The, and the Toiler, 1.
Confirmation, Benefits and Solemnity of, 208.
Conference, The Edinburgh World Missionary, 171.
Conference, A World, On Questios of Faith and Order, 165.
Confessional Basis, The Formulation of the General Synod's, 120.
Culler, Jacob Henry, D.D., Article by, 117.
Current Theological Thought, 140, 286, 437, 583.
Delk, Rev. Edwin Heyl, D.D., Articles by, 1, 556.
Departed Souls, The Present State of the, 53.
Dornblaser, Rev. T. F., D.D., Article by, 229.
Economic Questions, Luther and 387.
Education, Unification of Higher Lutheran, 350.
Edinburgh, The, World Missionary Conference, 171.
Eliot's, Dr., Religion of the Future, 30.
"Evolution Up-to-Date," 256.
Exposition of Lent, 540.
Faith, A World's Conference on Questions of, and Order, 165.
Faulkner, Prof. John Alfred, Article by, 387.
Feldman, Rev. W. H., Article by, 370.
Geesey, Rev. Fred. S., Article by, 53.
General Synod, Confessional Basis of, 120.
General Synod's, Formulation of the, Confessional Basis, 120.
General Synod, The "New Measure Movement" as a Factor in the Development of the, 505.
Genesis I, The Relation of, to the Following Chapters, 249.
God, Man's Relation to, 195.
Hankey, Rev. Upton A., D.D., Article by, 516.
Hantz, Prof. J. M., Article by, 195.
Hamsher, Rev. M. R., Article by, 208.
Illinois, The Lutheran Church in Southern, 412.
Individualism, 214.
Jacoby, Rev. J. C., D.D., Article by, 74.
Keyser, Rev. Leander S., D.D., Articles by, 282, 533.
Larimer, Prof. L. H., D.D., Article by, 245.
Lent, Exposition of, 540.
Lent, The Lutheran Usage of, 84.
Literature, Review of Recent, 152, 302, 455, 596.
Life, The, and Message of Tolstoi, 516.
Luther, and Economic Questions, 387.
Lutheran, The, Church in Southern Illinois, 412.

199804

Lutheran Theology, Glimpses of Early, 61.
Lutheran Church in America, The Desirability and Possibility of a United, 229.
Lutheran, The, Usage of Lent, 84.
Lutheran, The, Doctrine of the Holy Sacrament, 74.
Lutneranism, The Antithesis of Romanism and, 15.
Lutheran Unity, Foreign Missions as a Working Basis for, 476.
Man's Relation to God. 195.
Marx, Karl, 556.
Memoir, A, Samuel Alfred Ort, 245.
Message, The Life and, of Tolstoi, 516.
Method in Catechisation, 370.
Missionary Conference, The Edinburgh World. 171.
Missions, Foreign, As a Working Basis for Lutheran Unity, 467.
Nature, Does, Make Progress? 282.
Neve, Prof. J. L., D.D., Article by, 120.
Neve, Prof. J. L., D.D., Charge to, 117.
"New Measure Movement," The, as a Factor in the Development of the General Synod, 505.
Ortlepp, E. E., D.D., Article by, 84.
Original Sin, 319.
Ort, Samuel Alfred, A Memoir, 245.
Order, A World's Conference on Questions of Faith and, 165.
Pepper, George Wharton, Esq., Article by, 165.
Personal Presence, Christ's, 533.
Potts, Rev. A. D., D.D., Ph.D., Article by, 540.
Pragmatism, 272.
Progress? Does Nature Make, 282.
"Religion of the Future," Dr. Eliot's, 30.
Ritualism, 574.
Romanism, The Antithesis of, and Lutheranism, 15.
Sacraments, The Lutheran Doctrine of the Holy, 74.
Scholl, Rev. George, D.D., Article by, 505.
Seidel, W. C., D.D., Article by, 424.
Sifferd, C. W., D.D., Article by, 412.
Sherck, Rev. C. Rollin, Article by, 256.
Sin, Original, 319.
Singmaster, Dr. J. A., Articles by, 140, 286, 437, 583.
Smith, Rev. Arthur, H., D.D., Article by, 15.
Stork, Theo. B., Esq., Article by, 272.
Stump, Adam, D.D., Article by, 30.
Super, Prof. Charles W., D.D., Article by, 214.
Theology, Glimpses of Early Lutheran, 61.
Theology, The Most Recent Assaults of the Higher Critical, on the Person of Christ, 474.
Toiler, The Church and the, 1.
Tolstoi, The Life and Message of, 516.
Tressler, Prof. V. G. A., D.D., Ph.D., Articles by, 61, 350, 474.
Unification of Higher Lutheran Education, 350.
United Lutheran Church, The Desirability and Possibility of a, in America, 229.
Unity, Foreign Missions as a Working Basis for Lutheran, 467.
Voigt, Prof. A. G., D.D., 249.
Wenner, Rev. George U., D.D., Articles by, 361, 574.
Wentz, Prof. A. R., Articles by, 143. 294, 444, 588.
Wolf, Rev. L. B., D.D., Articles by, 171, 319, 467.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1911.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHURCH AND THE TOILER.

BY EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

Jesus Christ was a working man. He toiled with His hands the greater part of His earthly life. "Is not this the carpenter?" was a question implying an undisputed fact in the life of our Lord. His simple life was lived in poverty—an honorable poverty which cherished the refinements of Hebrew character and habits. After years of toil, He said, "The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." To forget that Jesus through so many years was a manual laborer is to forget an important note in the understanding of His Gospel first preached to peasant-farmers, fishermen and artizans of Galilee. This fact should dignify all labor and assure every common laborer of the possibility of securing and cherishing the highest type of spiritual experience in the midst of a life of toil.

Christianity in its initial form was a Gospel to the poor. The variant report by Luke of the beatitudes makes clear that not the "poor in spirit," but the "poor" were the first recipients of the blessings of grace. Whenever Christianity has been true to its founder, there the poor have received the main consideration of the Church. That "the poor have the Gospel preached to them" was one of the marks designated by Christ of the advent of the kingdom of God. All through the Galilean and Judean ministry of Jesus and marking also the growth of the Apostolic Church, we find that the rank and file of the disciples were

drawn not from the mighty but the lowly. The genesis of Christianity is in its sympathy with and aid of the poor, the struggling, the disinherited, the despised classes in society. It is not a class religion it is true. Its appeal is to a common and essential manhood irrespective of wealth, condition or title but its dominant sympathy and purpose is the saving of men plus the amelioration of poverty, disease and disability. Some German writers have sought to prove that Christianity was largely an economic movement and that Jesus was the great labor leader of His day. This distorted and half-baked theory of Christianity must not deter us from seeing the measure of truth in the contention that Jesus' sympathy went out mainly to the great body of the common people who were "like sheep without a shepherd." Much of the later battles over theological definition, Church organization and princely control of provinces were far away in purpose and spirit from the Gospel of Christ. When the Church is primarily concerned with theology, and rites and orders, she has lost her position, glory, and is running after means rather than pursuing and practicing a genuine Christianity. In an earlier paper on "The Modern Church and the Social Crisis," I have traced historically the facts diverting the Church from her central purpose; here I but state the fact that on the earthly side of his mission those who are in distress and want of every kind should be the first consideration of His leaders.

A survey of the history of the laboring classes is a *sine qua non* for an appreciation of what still remains for the Church to do for the toiler in our modern industrial life. It would be impossible in the compass of such a paper to offer even an outline of such a history. The work of such economists as Thorold Rodgers presenting the various forms of slave and feudal labor relations, and Dr. Richard T. Ely's *The Labor Movement in America* furnishes the background for our present problems. Here we can but recall that there has been a gradual advance in the better conditions and wages paid to the toilers on farms, in mines and in factories. In the general advance of wages and the conditions of living it is easy for us to lose sight of the fact that in some spheres of labor the working man has not profited. The rise of trades' unionism has materially benefitted all those within these organized classes but among women, children and men whose lack of infor-

mation and isolated labor are obstacles to united action, the situation demands the serious consideration and help of the Church. One instance is typical. Some time ago I met an old schoolmate who had nearly wrecked his body and mind in the management of a great manufacturing plant. I asked him why he had brought on such a pathetic physical condition. He told me he was expected to hand over annually to the employing firm $50,000 in clear profits. Later I learned how such a profit was secured by his company. Girls were hired at $1.50 per week, as an initial wage, and the greatest wage that they could aspire to in the factory was $4.00 per week. How any girl or woman in a modern city can support herself in health, appearance, and morals on such niggardly wages is a problem beyond my comprehension. The factory is daily pointed out to tourists as a modern wonder of enterprise and management but to one who knows the basis upon which such establishments succeed one is tempted to say that such success is wicked and destructive of all the higher and better life of society. The influx of a large foreign population unable to speak English, ignorant of our laws protecting employees, isolated from intelligent leadership, fearing to migrate from their present place of employment, and dominated by heartless superintendents whose sole aim is to turn out the most work at the smallest expenditure of time and money, presents a special phase of the labor problem which is a challenge to the Church. Such establishments are modern plantations of slaves whose dumb and helpless victims need the voice and pen of men who can reach the public ear and secure for their weaker brothers the consideration which will make healthful labor, rest and recreation possible.

The labor problem would not be banished by the disruption of the labor unions. Those who imagine that strikes and lockouts are the results primarily of labor organizations are far off the mark. The labor problem is a much wider and deeper question than that of organized labor. There is a general movement toward social and industrial democracy which sweeps onward whether unions do or do not ride on the tide of greater social and economic privilege. No doubt the organization of labor is partly responsible for the general unrest and demand for higher wages and shorter hours of labor, but it is a wider diffusion of knowledge, a clearer idea of how vast fortunes are accu-

mulated, the rise of the price of food stuffs, the craving for some voice in the determination of how the masses shall labor which are the underlying incentives to demand a betterment of conditions.

There are two common fallacies in the industrial world which we may as well face and answer before the Church can be of any real aid to the day laborer and artizan. The first is a fallacy of the ordinary employer of labor—especially the great corporations. It is usually phrased, "Can't a man run his own business to suit himself?" To this claim of absolute control there is but one true answer and that is, No! The denial is easily demonstrable. At every turn the owner and manager of a mill or plant has to conform to certain municipal or State laws concerning building, fire-protection, sanitation, child-labor, protection of life and limb from dangerous machinery, and hours of labor. Further, where the labor is organized, the scale of wages and conditions under which work is accomplished are modified. Many corporations on their own initiative, have sought to better the physical conditions of labor, and some have provided schemes of financial and social betterment, but no man or group of men can conduct their enterprise "just as they please" unless they please to be just and do the honest thing. The great public service corporations have a public to please as well as themselves and it is useless for the capitalist or manager of corporations to be defiant and claim absolute control over their interests. Theoretically the claim "to run one's business as he pleases," sounds quite just and heroic but actually it is autocratic and impossible in modern industrial life.

The other fallacy is held by some men and labor unions. It is this, that labor is the more important partner in every manufacturing or common carrying company, and therefore, has an equal, if not a superior, right with capital, in determining the conditions of labor, the wages paid the employees, and the method of carrying on the business. This usurpation of prerogative is the complement of the equally false assumption of the autocratic management of labor. It is around these antagonistic conditions that the real battle is being fought to-day. Mr. Henry White of the National Civic Federation thus states the situation: "The labor problem in other words, simmers down to a fight over control and the rights asserted by capitalists and

laborer are such as would justify their positions. With the employer the fight is to retain the unrestricted mastery of his business and with the union to restrict it. Ostensibly better pay and treatment are the immediate objects of labor combinations, but in reality the power to dictate working conditions is the underlying and the first object sought. To this end the influence of the leaders is directed, and often against the desire of the rank and file, who are looking for immediate concessions in pay."

Upon the legitimacy of workingmen to organize and bargain collectively for wages there is now little difference of opinion among economists and a disinterested public. President Taft in a recent speech before the railroad men fairly voices the attitude of the modern industrial student.

"I believe in labor organizations, and if I were skilled enough to become a member I should apply for membership. The fact is, I believe, I am an honorary member of the Steam Shovelers' Union. But in spite of that, and in spite of my sympathy with organized labor, I put above them, above everything, the right of every man to labor as he will, to earn the wages that he will, and, if he chooses, to stay out of labor organizations. That is the standpoint that the President of the United States must occupy in doing equality to every citizen of the United States.

"Now, the reason why I am in favor of organized labor is that labor must organize to be on an equality with its employers and the capital that its employers have. It has shown in the past that by such organization and by proper methods it can secure the wages to which it is entitled. It can secure an increase when the market is going up and earnings are increasing, and it can prevent the too hasty reduction when earnings are falling off and the business is becoming light.

"It is at the hands of intelligent organization that the cause of labor is to triumph. It is when labor organizations are not guided by intelligence and conservatism that the cause of labor suffers, and with the suffering of labor suffers the entire community."

It is the clash which arises over fundamental control which makes impossible the application of arbitration schemes in many industrial disputes. In a word the problem of elemental rights, as viewed from two conflicting points of view, is the creed of the modern labor problem and it will only be by a patient, intelli-

gent, and just working out of the question of the real, though not legal, partnership, which exists between capital and labor that we dare look for peace. Profit sharing and pension systems are praiseworthy and politic, but they are not the final solution of the labor problem.

It is in the face of this situation that the Church must stand for certain fundamental rights of both employer and employee. The Church does not pose as a judge or economist in the differences between employer and employee, but she should have very clear and definite opinions upon questions of fundamental justice, brotherhood and the plans for the protection and uplift of the toilers in factories, stores, mines and industrial plants.

I know of no better concise statement of the duty of individual churchmen to the toiler than that made by the Committee of the Federal Council of the Church of Christ, in 1908. The recommendations were adopted by the convention and read as follows:

"We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial problems. To us it seems that the churches must stand—

"For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life.

"For the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, a right ever to be wisely and strongly safeguarded against encroachments of every kind.

"For the right of workers to some protection against the hardships often resulting from the swift crises of industrial change.

"For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial discussions.

"For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality.

"For the abolition of child-labor.

"For such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

"For the suppression of the sweating system.

"For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labor to be lowered to the lowest practical point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

"For a release from employment one day in seven.

"For a living wage as a minimum in every industry and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

"For the most equitable distribution of the products of industry that can ultimately be desired.

"For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury.

"For the abatement of poverty."

This program of the Federation will seem sane and worth while to every disinterested student and citizen. It will appear defective and partizan only to the respective champions of labor or capital. But after all it is the third party—the public, in all great industrial disputes which finally determines the justice of a program for industrial betterment.

The remainder of this paper will address itself to a consideration of some of the more important statements in the above suggestions made by the Council.

The first fundamental right in the sphere of industry is that of self-maintenance. The right of a man to work for whom, wherever, and in whatever relation he pleases is a primal right in industrial justice. This proposition is axiomatic. The axiom is disputed, however, by the champions of the so-called "closed shop." In the interest of a class they attack the liberty of the individual. We have always believed that liberty, personal liberty in industry, is more fundamental and sacred than economic success. It must be granted from a purely tactical standpoint that it is better for the toilers as a whole to combine in organizations which are able to bargain collectively for wages and conditions of labor. In fact it seems rather near-sighted in a workingman to refuse to join a labor union and secure the advantage of combined effort for class betterment. The spirit and purpose of most labor unions are beneficial for the group represented, but, on the other hand, the surrender of the primal right of self-determination and the liberty of choice is too high a price to pay in come circumstances. There is a tyranny of unionism as well as capitalism which needs rebuke and correction. This theoretical and actual demand for freedom of personal industrial relation must be protected and conserved. The demand for "the closed shop" will always face the counter demand made by employers for "the open shop." Only as workingmen out of a free and full conviction of the righteousness and worth of a

labor union are induced to become members of the association dare the leaders hope to secure the general co-operation of the friends of the toilers. The resort to intimidation and physical violence delays the day when labor will be fully prepared to meet on equal terms the organized forces of capital.

The Church should stand for the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial dissensions. "Seek peace and pursue it" is an Apostolic injunction, and Jesus places in the midst of the beatitudes the declaration, "Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God." When conflicts arise between employers and employees involving the comfort, the financial interests, the safety, the lives of the general public, it becomes almost a necessity for constituted political authority, or the leaders of public opinion to intervene in such social warfare. When the dispute is largely a private and restricted affair between individual employers and firms and their operators in factory or plant, the general public has no right in the premises, to insist upon conciliation or arbitration. But, in such instances, the whole spirit of Christianity dictates such amicable and mutual consideration of rights and conditions as will lead to peace and good-will between the contending parties. Save when the elemental problem of control is at stake I can think of no situation where employer and employee should not be willing to confer with each other. The irritation which has arisen over dealing with union representatives whether employed or not employed by the particular firm or company does not seem to me a valid cause for refusal to consider the settlement of industrial difficulties. In the case of well organized and directed labor unions such as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and in a number of others a far more intelligent and lasting agreement can be reached through labor leaders, than with individual men. Mr. Seth Low, one of our greatest publicists, has made clear the logic of the situation in a speech made before the Contemporary Club of Philadelphia. He said:

"Please note my words carefully. I am not saying that everything which employes as a body ask for is therefore to be granted. I am simply emphasizing their right to conference; and, in the case of union men, to the recognition thus far of their union. Strikes no doubt will take place because of disagreement on the merits, even after such conferences are held; but a strike upon

the merits of a dispute settles something. So does an arbitration upon the merits; but a refusal to confer settles nothing."

In respect to those corporations which involve the health, the happiness, the very life of a community—what we now call public service corporations the public have an undoubted right to insist upon conciliation and arbitration. The refusal of such a semi-public corporation to consider the grievances of its employees whether through representatives of labor unions or not is unreasonable and will not be tolerated for long by an annoyed and suffering public. Mr. Low, in considering the strike and lockout of the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, further said:

"I have already made it clear that I think the car company was at fault, in the first instance, in declining arbitration; for when parties equally concerned cannot agree upon the merits, that is the natural and civilized way of reaching a working agreement. A corporation in which the stockholders claim for themselves all the privileges of combined action through their chosen officials occupies a weak position when it denies the same privileges to the laborers whom it employs; and a public service corporation which does this, is, in my judgment, often deliberately inviting trouble, because it is attempting to administer its affairs precisely as though stockholders have rights which laborers do not have.

"I do not think that the argument is conclusive that a public service corporation must be free to conduct its affairs as it pleases, because it is owned as private property. The abstract right of private property is everywhere subject to limitations in the public interest."

Any man whether he be layman or clergyman who proposes or attempts to offer his opinion to either party to such a dispute—especially the party who knows its side is weak—will probably be told that "there is nothing to arbitrate" and courteously advised "to mind his own business." Nevertheless the situation remains unchanged and the obligation to insist upon a peaceful settlement of such disputes is obvious to all disinterested parties. It will not be long before such belligerents will be brought together by either voluntary or enforced arbitration. The history of the New Zealand Experiment and The Canadian Law against

strikes justifies our own State legislatures in formulating some effective means of arbitrating disputes in the labor world.

It is the further duty of the Church to press for the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries and mortality. Important as these preventive measures are they can not be discussed in this paper. It is a pathetic fact that there are some occupations in which the average life of the men engaged is from six to eight years. The child-labor problem is now receiving more attention than ever. The cupidity of parents and the indifferent enforcement of existing laws still make possible the employment of children whose bodies and brains are starved by lack of pure air, exercise and school-life. But this crying evil must not be considered in this short hour. Women especially need the aid required to secure the proper hygienic safeguards and moral health so often jeopardized in factory conditions and regulations. The "sweating system," which is a menace to public health and the advance of the laborer, calls for nothing short of suppression. In a number of occupations shorter hours must be secured if there is to be that leisure without which there can never be a true preparation for domestic, social and political life. At least one day in seven—for rest and recreation—preferably Sunday—must be fought for wherever it may be denied. This contention should receive the strongest support of the Church. It is better to impair industry than to brutalize men. Proper management can arrange a release one day in seven from any form of toil. A recent writer in speaking of the action of the United States Steel Corporation looking to the gradual abolition of Sunday labor in their plant said:

"So, too, looked at from the purely business point of view, the management is now persuaded that the setting apart of Sunday as a complete day of rest for the operatives is, aside from moral and civic considerations, a sound policy. Of course, with its great plants and furnaces that must be kept alive, it is essential that there be some Sunday employment but it is believed to be possible to regulate this employment so that those who, by reason of the need of caring for the plants, are obliged to work on Sunday, may have their day of rest, working only six days out of seven. If there be moral influence and domestic associations which prevent the turning of Sunday into a day of dissi-

pation, great or small—and that is the modern tendency with respect to Sunday—then there will follow greater energy and higher productivity on the part of the employes. That is to say, it has been demonstrated that skilled artisans, whose habits are good, are able to do a larger amount of effective work in six days than they would be able to do if they were employed seven days in the week."

It is to the fundamental problem of a just division of the products of labor that the mind of the Church should in the main be directed. It is not proposed that churchmen should take up a question like a wage-scale or champion the particular prices paid for labor. This would be in violation of common sense and the principle enunciated by Christ "Who made me a judge or divider over you." But the plea for a living wage as a minimum in every industry and for the highest wage that each industry can afford—these claims are within the circle of justice and humanity. No two localities may be alike as to the cost of living and cost of travel to and from points of labor. What may be a living wage in a country town may be pitifully inadequate to keep a family in a large city. But the principle of the living wage is one for which the laborer must contend and the Church support. Where employers are influenced by the Christian spirit they go a step further and on their own initiative advance wages whenever and wherever the situation justifies it. The problem of wages bases itself not only on the law of supply and demand, but upon considerateness and generous treatment. Some months ago, John Mitchell spoke at Yale and said: "If I were asked to propose a solution of the whole industrial life, I should unhesitatingly advise a literal application of the Golden Rule. Not for one moment would I have the employer imagine that the rate of wages is based upon good-will or a desire to see the condition of labor uplifted. The basal fact determining the fund from which labor's compensation is drawn is the decrease or increase of the creative capacity and product of the laborer. Only as the capacity and the output of the laborer increases can the most just and generous of employers raise wages permanently. But it is possible to increase the wage-fund and to withhold the possible and rightful wage. There is where the Golden Rule comes into play. It is infinitely better to apply the law of love than to apply the strike or lockout. Among the many

revelations made to the management of the United States Steel Corporation is one which has taught a new view of the relation of employes to the company. The fundamental philosophy of the United States Steel Corporation is the economic principle of securing the largest production of the highest quality at the lowest cost. And it has been demonstrated to the corporation's satisfaction that one element in gaining high production together with high quality and low cost is the payment of satisfactory and therefore adequate wages and salaries to employes. It seems almost paradoxical, yet it can be almost demonstrated in dollars and cents, that high wages, provided they are paid for adequate service, do tend to reduce the cost of production. Twenty-five years ago that would have been regarded as a preposterous statement. To-day the management of the steel corporation and of some of the other greater corporations have discovered that adequate wages result in correspondingly adequate production."

Of course there is a mutual obligation in the application of the principle that applies alike to owners of plant and toiler. This labor problem at base is a moral problem. Mr. Mitchell is right in his diagnosis of the industrial situation. It is not so much a matter of mathematics as management, of manners, quite as much as money, of manhood rather than shrewdness and power. If such a spirit as the Golden Rule indicates was operative the remedies proposed by the radical Socialist and philosophic Anarchist would be purely academic. But so long as the immoral concentration of wealth and particularly the peonage system of some great industrial plants are permitted we must expect to face the steady demand for the civic and state ownership of mines, railways, manufacturies and the establishment of some collective industrial and social organization in which family and industrial ife are surrendered to the good of the whole. It is because the Church has been so slow and vague in coming to any active participation in social welfare that the toilers have grown hopeless in securing any aid from the Church as a club in this battle for the square deal and social freedom. Bishop Brewster has recently said in the *North American Review,* "The problem that immediately confronts the Church is not to Christianize socialism but to socialize the Christians, until the ideal principles shall be real and ruling prin-

ciples." The millions upon millions of dollars in the Rockefeller futurity fund are a part of the honestly earned but withheld wealth of the company's employes. It may be better for the world as a whole to keep the fund in Standard Oil certificates and spend the interest in charities and relief measures but I can't see that it is quite just or the best thing from the viewpoint of the toilers—even granted that they may be the best paid employes in the world. Only the wise, strong arm of the Federal Government holding in check the predatory wealth of our land can arrest the growth of a wholesale demand for the ownership and control of our producing and distributing agencies. But no law or commission can take the place of the socialized, Christianized individuals in our churches. Money and might so easily blind the eyes of men that even the saints of both sexes often require the wider vision which a sympathetic study of modern industrial conditions demands.

When the Church can not aid in securing arbitration or in obtaining immediate betterment in conditions and wages she may always sustain that attitude of regard and sympathy with the toiler and his sufferings which will bring a sense of hope and brotherhood into our social relations. The Church can stand for the masses as over against the classes. I believe she does in most communities. But there is ample room for her fuller expression of interest and co-operation in the betterment of our industrial life. The Church does not become partizan in extending sympathy to the wage-worker and especially to the unorganized, helpless, ignorant, baffled men and women of our alien population. Intelligence and wealth command the law. It is high time that poverty and ignorance call out the Gospel's forces for its aid and social regeneration.

The pulpit, the pew and the religious press have each an opportunity and a duty in the present crisis. The pulpit must preach the great law of industrial justice and brotherhood. To this end study, sanity of utterance and a brave heart must be combined. The spirit of conciliation and arbitration must be shown to be constant notes in the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. The pew, no less than the pulpit, has its part to play in securing a better understanding, between labor and capital, workingmen and employers. The pew must be willing to hear the message of the true prophet of righteousness. Some of the most consci-

ous and unconscious offenders against social and industrial justice sit in our pews. The pew should also invite to its midst the toiler who ventures into the aisles of the church. The ideal congregation is where the rich and the poor meet together and recognize that God is the maker of all. The religious press can make more specific and thorough the education in social duty commenced by the pulpit. Not until this enthusiasm for humanity equals the enthusiasm for God will the Church have been fully equipped to do her full duty towards the toiler.

Philadelphia, Pa.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE LIBRARY

ARTICLE II.

THE ANTITHESIS OF ROMANISM AND LUTHERANISM.

BY REV. ARTHUR H. SMITH, D.D.

It is a mark of the popular mind at the present day to pay little attention to denominational distinctions. Old religious issues are forgotten, and most men have the haziest notions of the principles which have formed the sharp lines of demarkation between great Christian communions. Few even have distinct conceptions of the vital differences between the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand, and the Protestant or Evangelical Churches on the other, especially as the latter are represented in the Lutheran Church. The popular mind is beclouded as to denominational distinctions, and its attitude is that of indifferentism. By many this condition is hailed as a good sign of growing Christian unity and good-will. However, it may be justly questioned whether this is a favorable sign, if it means, as we think it does, weakness of religious convictions, flabbiness of thought, indifference to doctrine, laxity in life, and failure to give loyal and specific service to Christ and the Church. Notwithstanding that the spirit of Christian unity is something to be desired, yet, believing that we should never forget the reasons for the faith that is in us, we desire to consider the "Antithesis of Romanism and Lutheranism."

By Romanism we mean the Roman Catholic Church in the specific sense of the papal and hierarchical system, which took possession of the true Catholic Church of Christ. The latter is divine and originated with the Apostles and with Christ; the former is human and arose in the 6th and 7th centuries after Christ, becoming corrupted by many abuses and departures from evangelical faith and doctrine. By Lutheranism we mean the specific evangelical Church and doctrinal system which arose in the 16th century out of the Reformation work of Luther, and which took his name. It was a protest against, and a liberation from the abominations and errors of the Papacy, and a return to the Apostolic teaching, ministry, sacraments, and church-life.

(Seiss-Eccl. Luth. 33). The word "antithesis" means opposition or contrast. Therefore, we speak of the opposition or contrast of these two systems, the Lutheran and Roman Catholic Churches. This antithesis is three-fold, appearing in doctrine, in life, and in spirit.

I. THE ANTITHESIS IN DOCTRINE.

We cannot better pursue this portion of our investigation than by following in a general way, the guidance of the Augsburg Confession, that matchless declaration, which we as Lutherans are proud to present as the confession of our faith. But first let us remark, the Lutheran Church is a conservative Church and the Lutheran Reformation was a conservative reformation. The radicalism was found in other reformation movements of that era. It is a very mistaken conception of Luther which many have formed, picturing him as an iconoclastic radical, raging up and down Germany, like a giant Thor of Teutonic mythology, striking sledge-hammer blows to the destruction of whatever happened to be in his path. Luther was a vigorous polemist and a dangerous adversary, but he was no radical. He was a conservative reformer, with a measure of caution for which most people do not give him credit, clear-eyed to see the truth and the good in Romanism, and purposing to cast off only that which was evil. He progressed unswervingly but slowly. When the radical Carlstadt and the fanatical Zwickau prophets had thrown Wittenberg into sore confusion while Luther was in the Wartburg, it was the great reformer who hastened from his retreat to Wittenberg, restored order, drove out the fanatics, and silenced Carlstadt, by his eight splendid sermons. Of this occasion Prof. Schaff has said that "eloquence rarely achieved a more complete and honorable triumph." There he appeared in his true character, a conservative reformer. As was Luther so is the Church which bears his name, not afraid to declare the doctrines in which there is agreement with Rome, and not hesitating to oppose Rome where they differ vitally.

Returning now to the Augsburg Confession, we note that there are numerous points in which it agrees with the Roman and the Greek Churches,—the confessedly catholic or universal Christian articles. Among these are Article I, of God and the

Trinity; Art. 3, of the Incarnation and Christ's mediatorial work; Art. 8, the validity of administration by unworthy ministers; Art. 9, of Baptism and the right of children to it; Art. 14, of Church Government; 16, of Civil Government; 17, of the second coming of Christ, the general resurrection, the eternity of rewards and punishments; 18, of Free Will; 19, of the Cause of Sin. There are several articles which mark the differences of Lutheranism from other evangelical bodies, but with these we now have nothing to do. We are concerned with those which set forth the antithesis of Romanism and Lutheranism. (Krauth-Con. Ref'n—254).

The first to which we call attention is Article 7, dealing with the doctrine of the Church:—"They likewise teach that there will always be one holy Church. But the Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the Gospel is correctly taught, and the sacraments are properly administered. And for the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrines of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that the same human traditions, that is, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, should be everywhere observed. As Paul says, "One faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," etc. When in the systematic progress of Christian Theology, we reach the doctrine of the Church, we stand at the point where Romanism and Lutheranism begin to diverge. All differences as to Soteriology had their origin in the differences with respect to this doctrine. Going back to the time when the last of the Apostles died, there is raised inevitably the question, "Where is the Apostolate now?" To this Catholicism answers,—and I quote Martensen, (Dogmatics, 345),—"It is in the living successors of the Apostles to whom the true tradition is entrusted, in Bishops, Councils, and Pope, who are to be recognized as the representatives and possessors of continual Apostolic inspiration." The Evangelical Church, on the other hand, replies, "That the only full and valid embodiment and expression of the Apostolate is to be found in Holy Scripture, which is the abiding voice of the Apostles in the Church." The former assumes a progressive inspiration continued through all times, considering the development of the Church to be "a quantitative prolongation of the beginning," as "a mechanical and self-progressive development of tradition," in which the divine element is predominant. But

the Lutheran Church traces inspiration back to its very source, and conceives of the Church's history as a free development, guided by the continuous activity of the Holy Spirit through the divinely ordained Means of Grace.

The same antithesis is reached by another phase of the subject. Man's supreme want is truth. (Luthardt "Saving Truths," 214-15). But he demands certainty about truth, otherwise he has no firm ground on which to stand. Where shall he find it? The Catholic Church takes the position that as the Church is the possessor of the truth, it must be infallible in order to give certainty. Quietly ignoring the claims of inspired Scripture as the ground of certainty, it agrees that the Holy Spirit is infallible, and as He continually dwells in the Church, He makes her infallible. But the Church cannot speak through the divergent voices of her many members, but must do so through her supreme representatives, her supreme tribunals. Therefore, there must be a hierarchy which is infallible, which attribute also belongs to the supreme Head, the Pope. Such in briefest form, is the reasoning of Rome, and upon this foundation has she built her magnificent structure. While the Church is a visible society of all baptized persons, who adopt a certain external creed, have the same sacraments, (seven in number), and acknowledge the Pope as their common head, the hierarchy is really the Church, while salvation is communicated by the priesthood. It is a religion of ecclesiastical authority.

Diametrically opposed to this view is that of Lutheranism. The ground of certainty and truth is in the inspired Word of God, not in the traditions of the Church, not in Councils, not in the hierarchy, not in the Pope. But Christ is now and ever the Supreme Head of His Church, and His Word is the supreme and only infallible rule of faith and practice. Both Luther and Melanchthon recognized the importance of dogmatic tradition and treated it with the utmost respect and caution, but Luther absolutely and resolutely refused to recognize any final authority for faith, except that of the Sacred Scriptures. This was the formal principle of the Reformation and it is the position of our Lutheran Church to-day. The Lutheran view, moreover, which is Scriptural and evangelical, is that the Church is the "congregation of the saints," its internal life, not its outward form being its essence. It consists in "the invisible fellowship of all those

who are united by the bonds of a true faith, which ideal union is but imperfectly represented by the visible Church, in which the true Gospel is taught and the sacraments are rightly administered." In a general way, the Church is the whole community of believers, representing in its visible united life, the invisible Kingdom of God as announced by Jesus.

It will be observed also that our Church insists upon the distinction between the visible and invisible Church. Rome regards the Church and the Kingdom of God as identical, and these two terms as coterminous and equivalent. It is true, the Church and the Kingdom are closely related, but they are not the same. The Kingdom of God is spiritual and is not visibly organized. The Church is, however, its great product on earth,—as Dr. Valentine says, (Theology, Vol. 2:368),—"the visible body of believers in organized fellowship, in the use of the means for personal salvation, the spread of the Gospel, and the conversion of the world. The organization of the Church is one, and the chief, of its historical manifestations." "It was Rome's terrible mistake when it identified its own hierarchical organization as the 'Kingdom of God' upon the earth." Prof. Franz Delitsch has written:—"We acknowledge the distinction of Church and Kingdom of God. The idea of the Kingdom is of larger extent. The final aim of history, according to God's eternal design, is not the accomplishment of the Church, but the divine Kingdom. However these two have neither a different center nor a different focus. Christ is the center of both, for it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell." Gerhardt has said:—"The distinction of the Church into visible and invisible is opposed to the opinion of the Papists, that the Church of Christ is so confined to the Pope of Rome and the prelates who are in regular succession, that whatever they affirm and believe must necessarily be received by all, and that there dare be no dissent from these in any manner upon any pretext." He says further:—"We therefore deny that the Church has been bound to any fixed seat in such a manner as to continue in it, with visible glory, by any perpetual succession." Melanchthon says in his Apology to the Augsburg Confession, "But the Church is not only the fellowship of outward objects and rites, as other governments, but it is principally a fellowship of faith and the Holy Ghost in hearts. The Christian Church consists not alone in

fellowship of outward signs, but it consists especially in inward communion of eternal blessings in the heart, as of the Holy Ghost, of faith, of the fear and the love of God." We have presented these authorities that the position of the Lutheran Church past and present may be clear.

The effect of the doctrine of the Church held by Rome, is seen, further, in her claims, (1) that the unity of the Church is to be secured by uniformity in organization and usage; (2), that she possesses a monopoly of saving grace, there being no salvation outside the true Church, namely herself; (3), that the priesthood are a distinct order and are priests in the true sense; (4), and that the Pope is the successor of Peter and the vicar of Christ on earth. On the contrary, the Lutheran Church holds, (1), that the unity of the Church is a matter not of outward form or organization, but of faith and doctrines; (2), that salvation is to be found in every Christian Church that possesses and properly administers the means of grace; (3), that all believers are a spiritual priesthood and that the clergy are ministers of the Word, not priests; (4), that there is no assured Apostolic succession in the Papacy, and that the Holy Spirit alone is the vicar of Christ.

The opposition of Romanism and Lutheranism appears also in their differing attitudes as to the notes of the Church,—the signs by which the visible Church is distinguished. The Lutheran Church takes the position in the 7th Article of the Confession, that these notes are the pure teaching of the Word or the Gospel, and the right administration of the sacraments. The test of the Church in every age is agreement in doctrine, and not in matters secondary or non-essential. This was the position held by the reformers. Luther says:—"Where God's Word is purely taught, there is also the upright and true Church"; while the Augsburg Confession describes the Church as the congregation or fellowship of the saints, "in which the Gospel is correctly taught and the sacraments properly administered." Thus is the Church distinguished and recognized;—in the possession and dispensation of the Means of Grace. But now what is meant by these notes? Certainly we ought to admit that the Word of God is "rightly taught" when it is presented plainly as it stands, without omitting any of its doctrines or making unwarranted additions to what is in the sacred Book; without perversion or

distortion of its plain teachings. Here we take issue with the Catholic Church, which claims the equality if not the superiority of tradition, and the superior right of the supreme tribunals of the Church to interpret Scripture. Therefore Romanism has been guilty of many perversions, suppressions, and additions with reference to the Word. She has sought to keep the Bible from the people, in order to maintain the supremacy of the hierarchy by the agency of popular ignorance; she has taught just as much of the Gospel as she considered consistent with her own claims; she has concealed some of the essential truths of the Gospel message of salvation; and has read into the Bible some things which are not there, such as salvation by good works, worship of the Virgin Mary, the invocation of the saints, and purgatory. The true Church will certainly be distinguished by the teaching of the Word according to its plain and sensible meaning and wording.

This test Lutheranism meets, holding that the Word of God should be accepted without addition or subtraction, as the supreme and normative authority in all matters of religion. It recognizes the value of tradition but denies its authority in the presence of the Scriptures. It holds that the latter should interpret themselves and that every man has the right to read the Bible for himself and to seek the message of the Gospel for himself. It is the principle of freedom of religious thought, and it is right.

As to the "right administration of the sacraments," certainly they ought to be administered as ordained and not changed or withheld in whole or in part. The papal system offends here with reference to the Lord's Supper by withholding one element from the laity and reading into it the sacrifice of the Mass. Our Church takes the ground that the sacraments are rightly administered when in accordance with the plain words of institution and with a proper recognition of the Savior's words, especially in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper,—"this is my body," and "this is the new testament in my blood." She teaches the real presence of the glorified body and blood of Christ in the elements, opposing positively the Roman teaching of transubstantiation. The bread and wine remain such, while, in the words of the 10th Article of the Confession, "In regard to the Lord's Supper, they teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and

are dispensed to the communicants in the Lord's Supper; and they disapprove those who teach otherwise."

We now come to another point of wide divergence between Romanism and our own evangelical faith,—the vital doctrine of justification. The Roman Catholic view grew up logically out of their extreme view of the Church and their superior but unwarranted emphasis upon her authority. It taught and now teaches, at least in practice, that good works are first necessary to forgiveness and salvation,—good works being essentially obedience to the authority and requirements of the Church, humble submission to the hierarchy, penances, observance of rites and ceremonies, etc. The Catholic Church professes to accept a doctrine of justification by faith, but in actual working practice the Catholic believer is led invariably to expect his salvation as grounded in his merits secured by his obedience and good works. The mediatorial work of Christ is pushed into the background. Our opposite Lutheran position is stated clearly in Article 4 of the Augsburg Confession:—"They in like manner teach that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, merits, or works; but that they are justified gratuitiously for Christ's sake, through faith; when they believe, that they are received in favor, and that their sins are remitted for the sake of Christ, who made satisfaction for our transgressions by his death. This faith God imputes for righteousness before him." (See Romans 3 and 4). Also in the 6th Article, "concerning new obedience," it is declared that our good works are to be performed because it is God's will, and not in the expectation of thereby meriting justification before Him. For remission of sins and justification are secured by faith; as the declaration of Christ testifies: "When ye shall have done all those things, say, we are unprofitable servants." Again in Article 20, "of good works," the position is taken strongly, that while good works are necessary, they "cannot reconcile God, or merit the remission of sins, and grace, and justification." But "being justified by faith we have peace with God."

D'Aubigne, the historian says:—"The Church had fallen because the great doctrine of justification through faith in Christ had been lost. It was therefore, necessary that this doctrine should be restored to her, before she could arise. Whenever this fundamental truth should be restored, all the errors and devices

which had usurped its place, the train of saints, works, penances, masses, and indulgences, would vanish. The moment the one Mediator and his one sacrifice are acknowledged, all other mediators and all other sacrifices disappear." (Vol. I:69). The remedy was plain and Luther, in the Providence of God, was led to it, and preaching the great truth of justification by faith in Christ, he sought to awake and raise Christendom to a new evangelical life. "It is that," said he, "which forms the Church, nourishes it, builds it up, preserves and defends it. No one can rightly teach in the Church, or successfully resist its adversary, if he be wanting in attachment to this grand truth."

Our position is this, that salvation is to be found in faith alone, i. e., "in the surrender of the whole spirit to Christ while the ordinances of the Church and all kinds of works are profitable only so far as they proceed from faith." (Hase). Such is our grand but simple system of faith, declared as we have seen in the Augustana, and outlined at length in our subordinate symbols. The Formula of Concord says:—"We reject and condemn the following modes of speaking, viz., when it is taught and written that good works are necessary to salvation. Also that no one ever has been saved without good works. Also that it is impossible without good works to be saved." Again it declares:—"We believe, teach, and confess that faith alone is the means and instrument whereby we lay hold of Christ, and thus in Christ of that righteousness which avails before God, for the sake of which this faith is imputed to us for righteousness." (Rom. 4:5). Also that "God forgives us for our sins out of pure grace without any work, merit, or worthiness of ours preceding, attending or following." These entire sections ought to be quoted but they are too long. However they should be given careful study. This doctrine of justification by faith was the material principle of the Reformation and is the central doctrine of what is distinctive in the Lutheran system of theology. .. To the all important question, "What must I do to be saved?" it replies, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Our theology is therefore Christo-centric. It is faith in Christ as our personal Savior, that particularly differentiates Lutheranism from Romanism.

There are other doctrines in which the opposition of the papal and Lutheran systems appear, but we can do little more than

notice them. Especially the Augsburg Confession in Article 2, presents the clear Lutheran view of original sin,—that all men "are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God or confidence towards Him, and with sinful propensities." It condemns the Pelagianism of Rome whose members "deny that natural depravity is sin, and who, to the disparagement of the glory of Christ's merits and benefits, contend that man may be justified before God by the powers of his own reason." The Reformation indeed had its origin in this doctrine, in the deep consciousness of human impotence on account of sin. This led Luther to Christ and justification by faith. The Augustana also presents the Lutheran view of the ministry in Art. 5, as against the priestly conception of Rome; the opposition of Lutheranism in Art. 13, to the "opus operatum" in the sacraments; and to the worship of saints, in Art. 21. In the second part, the Roman views of the Mass, Confession, and human traditions are condemned in Articles 3, 4, and 5.

Leaving now the antithesis in doctrine, let us consider:

II. THE ANTITHESIS IN LIFE.

The life of an individual and the life of a church are the fruits of their faith. The quality of faith determines the quality of character to correspond. It was therefore in the necessity of the case that the life of the Roman Catholic Church should develop along lines parallel to her doctrinal aberrations. Naturally, as she emphasizes more and more the visible Church and her assumed supreme authority in temporal things as well as spiritual, she began to buttress her claims with elaborate and spectacular rites and ceremonies and the assertive claims of priestly character and temporal power, while evangelical truths were concealed. It was also natural that the masses of the people should inevitably grasp and depend upon the externals of religion and miss the spiritual content. This took place with accompanying and growing ignorance, and the lowering of religious and moral standards, until the most terrible crimes and sins were prevalent within the Church unchecked and unrebuked. This is still true except where Catholicism has come in contact with the leaven of Protestantism. We do not mean to say there are no good and pious Christians in the Catholic Church. There are and have

been many such, in spite of the perversions of Romanism. But it is a fact of much significance that in the Middle Ages, men and women of the nobler kind could conceive of a truly religious life only in the monastery, the convent, or the hermit's cave, severed from the world. Asceticism was the natural and extreme recoil of the best minds from the kind of religion exemplified by Rome. But in the secondary reaction the monasteries and convents and monkish orders became hot-beds of luxury and vice. Therefore the Lutheran Church in her symbols has condemned the celibacy of the priesthood as well as the priestly principle, secret confession, monastic vows, the abuse of church power, and human traditions.

The conditions that prevailed in the Middle Ages still are found in large measure wherever Rome has full sway unmodified for good by the leaven of Protestant contact and influence. A man may do or be anything, no matter how evil, so long as he is an obedient servant of the Church. That Rome in its life is little changed, is evidenced by Dr. Francis E. Clark, some time ago, in the *Missionary Review*. He had recently returned from South America and wrote of conditions there. He says:—"The Roman Catholic Church of South America is as different from the same Church in North America as Spain is different from New England. In South America we still find the darkness and corruption of the Middle Ages." "It is admitted even by intelligent Catholics that in South America the Church is decadent and corrupt. The immorality of the priests is taken for granted. Priests' sons and daughters, of course born out of wedlock, abound everywhere, and no stigma attaches to them or to their fathers and mothers." Dr. Clark says that in every large city there are large public orphan asylums where infants are received and no questions asked, and that a considerable percentage are children of priests. Gross superstition is still cultivated assiduously by the Roman Church. It is not surprising that under these conditions in South America, Central America, Mexico, Spain, France, Italy, the Philippines, unbelief and indifference to spiritual things are the rule among the men. The best of them are repelled from religion. Other eminent observers give similar testimony.

It is a very different life that the Lutheran Church has developed. She has emphasized the spiritual side of doctrine and

worship, and has given her people the best possible religious instruction from childhood up by the catechism and the ministry of the Word. She has led the believer directly to Christ and to the Scriptures, while she has shown him the way of true spiritual repentance and faith. While the Roman Church has reserved the public worship for the priests and choirs, Lutheran liturgical orders have put the worship in the hands of the congregation. She has not sought to dazzle the eye but to touch the heart and appeal to the mind. The result is seen in a high and beautiful type of Church life and personal piety, spiritual in character and influence. Luther's own personal life and his home life are fine examples of the fruits of a true evangelical faith. These examples have been duplicated thousands of times in Lutheran homes, in every generation since the Reformation, whose piety has been cheerful, joyous, stable, practical, marked by firmness of convictions, simple-hearted, intelligent faith, kindliness of spirit, and conscientious devotion to duty, while prayer has made the atmosphere out of which it has grown. It is certainly a significant and gratifying fact that Lutheran lands, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the best Lutheran communities in America, have shown the best civilization, most progress in education, purest types of character, the steadiest respect for law, the least amount of crime and vice.

It is true, there have been times of spiritual declension, and Rationalism has laid its chilling touch upon the Church's fervor, and we acknowledge freely that there have been many unworthy people in the Lutheran fold, just as on the other hand we bear witness that there have been many fine examples of Christian piety in the Catholic Church. But the rule holds that the natural fruit of Romanism is externalism in religion, while that of Lutheranism in contrast, is spirituality and elevated ideals. In its broadest aspect, the life of the Lutheran Church, in piety and polity, is free, quickening to the intellect, ennobling and lifting up nearer to God.

III. THE ANTITHESIS IN SPIRIT.

We wish yet to refer just as briefly as we can, to the antithesis of Romanism and Lutheranism in spirit. By the spirit of the Church, we mean its formative mental attitude towards human

progress, religious, intellectual, political and social. The spirit of Rome is reactionary, traditional and repressive. That of Lutheranism is progressive, promotive of freedom of thought, (for the right of private judgment was a leading principle of the Reformation), and encouraging to the intellectual pioneer. These two vitally antagonistic mental attitudes of these great systems are clearly the logical and necessary effects of their antithesis first in doctrine and second in life. When Rome in the past, encouraged literature, philosophy, science and art, it was always within a limited scope, whose boundaries were determined by the arbitrary restrictions of the papal hierarchy. There was no freedom of development. In these fields, with the exception of art, progress was always stunted. History cannot forget the heavy hand of Rome laid on Abelard, Bruno, Galileo, Arnold of Brescia, Huss, Savonarola, and many others. It is true that literature flowered beautifully in France in the age of Bossuet, but Bossuet was made a possibility only because then it was the day of the partial triumph of Gallican liberties.

The spirit of Protestantism, of which Lutheranism is the chief representative, has ever encouraged culture, the fine arts and freedom. I need not enlarge on this plain fact of history. I want to quote a few sentences from Macaulay with reference to the contrast of the two systems under consideration. He says: "The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets." "Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Canada remain inert, while the whole continent around them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise." What the historian says of Protestantism applies to Lutheranism, which is its chief representative.

The Lutheran Church, in its true tendency and influence has ever evinced itself as friendly to religious and civil liberty, while it has inspired art and science to reach beyond the restricted limits allowed by the Roman selfish tyranny. The broadening field of philosophy also has been made possible by the quickening impulses given to thought by the former. In short Lutheranism has not failed to discern the true relation of Christianity to culture, perceiving that it is "not to be something apart, but rather a leaven to permeate all things." What Dr. Fisher says of Protestantism in his volume on the Reformation, (464), is true of our own faith and system. "It was a religion of the spirit and liberty. Luther advised monks and nuns to marry, to engage in useful employments, to get from life all reasonable pleasures and to do good in a practical way. Religion is not to divorce itself from science, art, industry, recreation, from anything that promotes the well-being of man on earth; but religion is to leaven all with a higher consecration." Such is the spirit of Lutheranism, neither an Hebrew isolation, nor a pagan self-indulgence, nor a Catholic reactionary strangling of the human intellect and will.

The antithesis in spirit which we have outlined is not a thing of the past, as some might suppose, but a thing of the present, yea, of this very hour. Rome has been accustomed to reiterate her proud boast that she never changes; that the possessor of the keys of St. Peter the one-time mistress of the Seven Hills is always the same. This is nearly true. Certain it is Rome does not change except under the sternest compulsion. Her spirit is unchanged. Witness present conditions at Rome, and especially the encyclical against Modernism, issued by Pius X, explaining and applying his Syllabus, a deliverance which aims at the suppression of research and forbids liberty of thought in teachers and scholars. One leading journal, (The Independent), declares it to be "the most ominous event in the history of the Christian Church that has appeared since the declaration of infallibility by the Vatican Council," while a Catholic priest declares that "Pius X has brought in an era of reactionary repressions which is worse than anything of the kind in the memory of living men." The philosopher DesCartes, generations ago, was a Catholic and sought to keep his philosophy within the limits allowed by Rome. Such was his caution, that when he heard that

Galileo had been condemned, he suppressed his own work on "The World," in which he had advocated the Copernican view, and which was ready for the press. And yet, the Cartesian philosophy was denounced by the Sorbonne. (Fisher, Id., 453). To-day, in the twentieth century, Father Tyrrel, thinking too much, saying too much, is crushed and silenced by Rome. Left penniless, he submitted, and the Pope graciously, as one has said, permits him to eat bread. Father Loisy is bolder and holds that no Pope can strangle his free thought. But will he run the risk? Will he submit also?

That was a remarkable address delivered by Abbe Houtin of France before the Congress of Religious Liberals in Boston. He spoke of the liberal elements in the Catholic Church and divided them into three classes, saying that those of the first class seek to remain at peace with Rome; those of the second have practically drifted into Deism, and those of the third class into Atheism, although many of them dare not yet avow their views. That is the spirit of Rome, rule or ruin; crush into submission or drive to the extreme of unbelief. Liberty of thought has its perils and often runs to excesses. These the Lutheran Church never approves, nor can we sympathize with the Congress referred to, but nevertheless, the human mind cannot be crushed and its thought strangled, for progress is born of freedom. It is the duty of the Church to guide wisely, to instruct, to enlighten, to awaken the souls of men to their great spiritual inheritance, but not to usurp the functions of Providence as does Rome. Such is the attitude of Lutheranism. The antithesis is sharp.

But we have said enough as to the contrast of Romanism and Lutheranism in doctrine, life and spirit. The Lutheran Church stands as the advocate of pure evangelical truth, the conservator of piety and a spiritual religion, the promoter of knowledge and education, and the encourager of culture, research and freedom. Therein she is the antithesis of Rome.

Ashland, Ohio.

ARTICLE III.

DR. ELIOT'S "RELIGION OF THE FUTURE."

BY ADAM STUMP, D.D.

It is but fair to give the author's own caption to his lecture, which he delivered at the close of last year's Harvard Summer School of Theology, and which has been published in the October (1909) number of the *Harvard Theological Review*. As the corrected and authenticated form of this famous address, which still remains a live wire in our periodical literature, we will take this article, and not any press-report of it, as the basis of some remarks. We shall thus not be in any danger of misquoting it and we will not purposely do an injustice of that kind. Although the whole piece, as a product of thought and a literary composition, reveals haste and frequent inelegance in diction, it must stand as the noted educator's deliberate opinion. By these words he must be willing to stand or fall, and we suppose he is.

However, the chief weight that attaches to this much-discussed deliverance does not consist in the fact that it contains the religious views of Dr. Eliot, but that it is symptomatic of the times. Many of our highly educated and cultured contemporaries hold a similar stand-point. Likely most of the advocates of modern science and philosophy would broadly subscribe to such a creed, if to any at all, and certainly our entire current literature, from the most pretentious magazine down to the most humble patent-outside county paper, is saturated with the liberalistic views of religion. Such is part of the atmosphere of our present-day thought. Not only cannon, but also pop-guns, are being fired against the citadel of divine truth, and the danger is, not that the walls will fall or that the battered gates will yield, but that many of its professed defenders will throw the keys out to the enemy.

The lecture under consideration usually is styled "Dr. Eliot's New Religion." Well is it so labeled, for it certainly is not that of Christianity. It simply is a revamped form of the old Arianism and Socinianism, galvanized by the spirit of modern scientific speculation. It is but an old heresy, taken out of the

morgue of dead faiths and given the semblance of life, by infusing into its corpse some of the energy which true religion has preserved in the world and calling the deceptive recrudescence "new." In the body of his lecture Dr. Eliot himself uses this nomenclature and explains the sense in which he employs it—"not," says he, "that a single one of its doctrines and practices is really new in essence, but only that the wider acceptance and better actual application of truths familiar in the past are new."

In spite of his stumbling effort at division into negative and positive, his composition is loose-jointed, rambling, and prolix, and consequently does not easily yield to analysis. But for our own convenience, and so as to show that we do not reject every line of it, we will first emphasize the points which are approved.

Dr. Eliot believes in the personality of God and the spirituality of man. Over against bald materialism he witnesses a good confession. He also teaches that the universe is controlled by a loving Providence. He is a foe to superstition, to dead religious formalism, and upholds religion, not as a mere profession, but as a life, pleading for a practical sympathy, and helpful altruism among men. Never did pure ethics and right character receive a warmer advocacy. Dr. Eliot in his line has served humanity well and there is much in his address which, if applied, would make the world better. He may not be an optimist, but he certainly is an ameliorist, who has labored and still hopes for betterment in the human race. He thinks he has stated the form of religion which, as a means, would best attain this noble end. In this we deem him to be sincere but mistaken. With all due respect for his honorable career we have no use for his system of religion. It is indeed not new, but during a millennium and a half of history, under ever changing phenomena, it has proven itself incapable of effecting a single reformation, has produced but few martyrs to any good cause, and has ever been the fruitful mother of the very skepticism which it has promised to cure. Where are the Unitarian missionaries, who have planted the cross among the heathen? Where has this cult, which is only an imitation of Christianity, ever sustained itself alone by its own moral and spiritual force? In America it has been a perennial parasite upon orthodoxy and yet it is decaying amidst the denominations upon whose blood it has been feeding. True, it numbers among its adherents some great names, but, as

Mr. Joseph Cook used to say, "a doctrine is not to be judged by the men who profess it, but by the men it makes." Tested by this rule, we are pursuaded that this "religion of the future," left to work out its own natural results, will not produce the Christian heroes of the future or do the world a superior amount of good.

In one sentence we find our Professor saying, "Religion is not a fixed, but a fluent thing." In the next sentence he says, "The conceptions of religion prevalent among educated people change from century to century." It is surprising that a reputed scholar should not have discovered that he was here speaking of two widely different topics. The term "religion" and the term "conceptions of religion," though related, are far from being equal factors of the same equation. Yet Dr. Eliot writes as though they were and is not conscious of self-contradiction. That religion itself is a variable thing we deny; that man's "conceptions of religion" are as changeable as a weather-vane, we confess. Every wind of doctrine turns some men's minds to all points of the compass. But true religion, like the pole star, ever shines in the same place in the firmament. Theology may be progressive or otherwise, but the absolute truth, which is its subject, remains a constant quantity. Dr. Eliot, logically, must be driven to the same conclusion, since, in effect, he says that the essence of religion is the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. But how could such a foundation be one thing in the first century and altogether another in the twentieth? Man's view-point of that essence may be different from age to age, the emphasis being shifted from time to time, but the great luminary of truth remains the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. It always is the bane of rationalism that it either confuses religion itself with the conceptions of religion—the substance with its accidents—or calls the wrong things the accidents. Hence it never considers any conclusion final, but looks upon all things as being in a state of flux and is constantly wandering after *ignes fatui* in the quagmires of scientific and philosophic speculation,—ever groping about in the gloaming for a foothold which it never can feel sure of having found.

The first negative of the religion of the future shall be that it "will not be based on authority, either spiritual or temporal."

If by "temporal" Dr. Eliot means to refer to Roman Catholi-

cism or Christian Science we, of course, agree with him. We believe neither in the power of the Roman See nor in the spiritual monopoly of the Mother Church at Boston. Neither the Pope nor Mrs. Eddy has the right to lord it over private judgment or the individual conscience, in the interpretation of Scripture or the conduct of life. Nevertheless, by denying all authority in religion, one is kindling a fire which, if allowed to blaze into a conflagration, one would be glad to quench, if only it could yet be done. That is the argument of the anarchist, who usually chafes under the restraints of religion, before he kicks against the goads of civil and criminal law. Far better that all the world should be under the Roman Pontiff, rather than under the liberalism of so-called free thought or the rationalism which Dr. Eliot upholds, which finds no higher seat of authority for religion than the human intellect. In this first proposition Francisco Ferrer, whom the Spaniards lately blunderingly elevated to martyrdom as a pedagogic anarchist and atheist, and the ex-President of Harvard are in perfect rapport. Emma Goldman, the American high priestess of the red flag and instructress of Czolgosz, would say "Amen" to it. In declaring that the Reformation substituted an "authoritative book" for an "authoritative church," the highest possible compliment is paid that glorious epoch in history. With his animadversion on verbal inspiration we are not concerned. The Church is not bound to any theory of inspiration, only to the fact. We believe it is plenary and sufficient, and, unless we retain the Bible as our rule of faith and practice, unless we keep its divine oracles as the ultimate criterion of appeal, Christianity as a distinctive religion will disintegrate and disappear from the earth. It will not do to say that it was founded without the New Testament in its written form. Such is the claim of the cheap documentary scholarship, of which we hear too much in our times. It is a plausible argument, but not a real one, for the Church was founded upon the present contents of The Book and upon nothing besides. It contains not only the facts, but also the personalities, of its original founders. Afterwards such a record as a norm of truth was felt to be needful as a guide in all difficulties and disputes. Such was the providential origin of the New Testament and without it Christianity, like a magnificent frigate, without helm or compass, can only come to wreck upon the tur-

bulent seas of time. According to the new religion, as well as according to the new pragmatic philosophy, every man is to be a law unto himself. In faith and morals, as well as in civil government, such a condition can end only in confusion. "To the law and to the testimony! if they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them." (Isa. 8:20). Vainly does modernism seek spiritual authority and divine revelation in the human soul and set it up against the external or objective word of Jesus Christ and the sacred canon. This, and not the dry-rot of a fallible subjectivism, must remain Christianity's court of final recourse. Wherever it exists without this divine sanction it already is moribund, as today is the case with Unitarianism and all kindred idealisms.

"It is hardly necessary to say that in the religion of the future there will be no personifications of the primitive forces of nature."

In these words Dr. Eliot states his second negation. We readily and thoroughly agree with it at sight.

His third negative, however, is very sweeping and revolutionary. "There will be in the religion of the future," he says, "no worship, express or implied, of dead ancestors, teachers, or rulers; no more tribal, racial, or tutelary gods; no identification of any human being, however majestic in character, with the Eternal Deity."

To a devoted Christian this is blasphemous language. The fact that any cultured gentleman should so insult our holiest feelings by listing the adoration of Jesus Christ with ethnic idolatry and heathen ancestor-worship almost removes him beyond our patience. We are here reminded of Emerson, who had the temerity to mention Jesus and Plato in the same breath. Such classification we indignantly repudiate. Besides, Dr. Eliot manifests an insidious, subtle, yet coarse cowardice, by concealing his attack on the divinity of Christ behind glittering generalities. Why does he not name Him? The reader, anyway knows exactly whom he means by his veiled "human being." In the very next sentence he quotes the saying of Jesus to the Woman of Samaria concerning the spiritual worship of God. The implication of course, is that even He taught that we should worship the Father alone, as though we could be oblivious of the fact that this same Jesus declared that He and the Father are

one and sublimely enough invited all men to come to Himself to obtain satisfaction for the deep needs of the soul. (Matt. 11:25-30; John 10:30; 14:9). In consonance with Harnack, in his "Wesen des Christenthums," Dr. Eliot would have us think that Jesus knew nothing but His Father as an object of adoration, and that He was the Son only in the sense of having a higher knowledge of God. As the testimony of St. John so positively contradicts this standpoint, his is not the favorite gospel of rationalists. Yet he alone records the incident of the Woman at the Well and its lessons. May we infer that Dr. Eliot, by quoting it, considers all of John's gospel genuine and authentic? We fear not.

His argument that patriotism, according to which each side in a war between Christian nations prays to the same God for success, is "the survival of a tribal or national quality in institutional Christianity," plainly is a non-sequitur. It is but another specimen of the innumerable fancies of Darwinism, which should have a Nobel prize for the most monstrous imaginary feats of the century. It is and will remain an instinct of human nature to consider its own side in the right and to think that even God should favor its cause, and no international or cosmopolitan education ever will erase it. It is rooted in the caverns of the sub-conscious soul by nature itself. Religion is not its cause, nor is Christianity its apologist.

But it is evident that the new religion is not Christianity and therefore we hope it will not be that of the future. With the elimination of Christ as the peculiar Son of God and the divine Redeemer, the old religion will disappear from among men. It is not strange that this by no means brief discourse should be silent about the Resurrection of Jesus. Were the Apostolic and primitive heralds of the cross quiet about it? Would they have been so successful in their propagandism, if they had been? But the entire clan of liberalistic and rationalistic religionists ignores this most stupendous fact in historical Christianity. There is to be no Apostles' Creed, no historic Christ, but only an idealized Jesus, who would be no better than an idealized Buddha, Socrates, or an altogether fictitious reformer. How these ethicalists can expect first to rob Christianity of its chief distinctive features and still profess to be its advocates, is a psy-

chological problem which demands solution. Its declared antagonists could not do worse.

"In the religious life of the future the primary object will not be the personal welfare or safety of the individual in this world or any other. That safety, that welfare or salvation, may be incidentally secured, but it will not be the primary object in view. The religious person will not think of his own welfare or security, but of service to others, and of contributions to the common good." By these words the fourth negative is set forth. We can not find anything objectionable in such explicitly altruistic language, but what is new in this sentiment? The unselfishness, which is here inculcated, was from the beginning the teaching of the Gospel and the practice aimed at by the institutional Church. It is the ambient air of Paul's epistle. The man who could be content to be saved himself, without caring for the salvation of others, has always been considered a monster by Christianity. It is the doctrine of the survival of the fittest that crowns such an one the paragon of the race. He is Nietzsche's superman, indulging his unbridled self-interest, treating all others as booty to gain his ends, who alone is considered worth living; but the old religion has always regarded such an incarnation of egotism as a beast. A self-abasing benevolence has been the ideal of evangelical Christianity. The redemption of the entire race, the care of the unfortunate and the succor of the poor, is the ardent dream of the Church. To leave the world better than we found it, to be a blessing to our neighbors, is to-day the highest ethical standard for a true believer. To be a man among men for mutual helpfulness, not the useless existence of the anchorite, is held to be the normal life of a saint. To spend and to be spent, to lose one's self in sacrifice for one's fellows is, and always has been, the prime purpose of Christian consecration, of which the gigantic benefactions, social ameliorations, and missionary operations of the present time are daily proof, and such will be more and more the religion of the future, but this will be nothing new. Human weakness will always more or less fail in its undertakings, but this is and always was the Christian ideal.

In the fifth negative we reach the red rag which always has enraged rationalism as much as the crimes of men. "The religion of the future will not be propitiary, sacrificial, or expia-

tory," says our author. Then he goes on to mention the source of religion as being "fear of the supernatural powers as represented in the awful forces of nature." He means to imply that there is no such thing as a divine revelation; all the religion there is has been evolved in the brain of man. In another place further on he says explicitly: "If, now, man discovers God through self-consciousness, or, in other words, if it is the human soul through which God is revealed, the race has come to the knowledge of God through knowledge of itself; and the best knowledge of God comes through knowledge of the best of the race." Even the elder Hodge, in his "Systematic Theology," appeals to human consciousness as a means of interpreting the divine nature, but to regard this power of the soul as the source of religion is one of the impossible conceptions of the evolution theory. But Dr. Eliot, building on nature-worship, claims that terror of imaginary deities led man to offer sacrifices to placate them and that both the Hebrews and "Paganized" Christians have perpetuated this expiatory notion of barbarous superstition. The fact is that it was man's bad conscience, his sense of guilt, that impelled him to propitiate God, or gods, by means of blood. Christianity answers this deepest cry of the remorseful heart because, on the theological side, it reveals the Father of grace, and because, on the anthropological and redemptory side, it furnishes the vicarious death of Christ as the ground of pardon. All the rest is only incident as not a few isolated passages or a strained exegesis, but the entire texture of the New Testament proves.

All theories of the Atonement count for little; it is the fact that we can not surrender. The first heresy of its deniers is their failure to recognize the exceeding sinfulness of sin. (Rom. 7:13). In their opinion there has been no fall, except a fall upward. They take delight in glorifying man, in portraying his pre-eminent talents, in forecasting his exalted destiny. But they minify the immense gulf which yawns between the ineffably Holy God and sinful man. Consequently all ethicalists teach that we can render an acceptable righteousness by our own efforts, that in fact there is no offended Divine Justice to be reconciled by anything but a virtuous life. This is the impossible dream of Pharisaism, Pelagianism, and mediaeval Popery. A sinner, however, can not in himself please the sin-hating God. He must have a substitute, a daysman, a representative and in-

tercessor, whose worthiness shall avail for him before the august throne, and such is Jesus Christ, the appointed Lamb who bears our sin, upon whom was laid the iniquity of us all. If the New Testament does not teach so, then human language has no definite meaning. The work-righteousness theory of the Jews and the ethical-merit theory of the new religion St. Paul and Martin Luther once swept from the palace-walls of truth as flimsy cobwebs before Logic's broom of steel. Yet these modernist spiders would spin the rent gossamer over again. But the old Gospel ship is not roomy enough to carry them across the sea. They are too much swollen with pride. Their conceit and vanity bulge too largely. Its passengers must be born from above. Man is in need of a heavenly dynamic to reconstruct his character.

The sixth negative is expressed as follows: The religion of the future will not perpetuate the Hebrew anthropomorphic representations of God. With the expletive "Hebrew" in that sentence to modify it, we readily adopt it. With the terminology which was necessary in the childhood of the race, when it could comprehend only pictorial revelation, we are no longer concerned. The shell of the old dispensation is not so precious that we would mourn its loss. Having extracted its kernel, we may carelessly cast it away. The civil laws and sacrificial rites of Moses are of little use to us except as types. But the Doctor asserts that these Hebraic conceptions "were in great measure carried over into institutional Christianity." Later on, however, he acknowledges that all ideas concerning God must necessarily be anthropomorphic. "What else," he asks, "can a human view of God's personality be? The finite can study and describe the infinite only through analogy, parallelism and simile; but that is a good way." Here, then, there is no dispute. We no longer desire to shape our thoughts in ancient moulds. The Jewish notion of Jehovah as King and Judge has been superseded by Divine Fatherhood as taught by Jesus. Thus the anthromorphism of this enlightened age has indeed made that of preceding centuries look "archaic and crude." Theology truly is a variable quality, but religion itself is unchangeable. The one is an immutable rock, the other is the foliage that grows and fades upon its crags year by year.

But we have come to the seventh and last formal negative.

"The religion of the future," prophesies the ex-President of Harvard "will not be gloomy, ascetic, or maledictory." We hope not, but when he goes into details and says, "It will believe in no malignant powers—neither in Satan, nor in witches. neither in the evil eye, nor in the malign suggestion," we have only to reply that, if, by any fair exegesis, the Bible teaches that God is a person, then it just as positively proves that the Evil One is. Of course, it is not hard for those who think that the Hebrews invented Jehovah to believe that they also invented Beelzebub. But those who are convinced that the Holy Spirit is a personal being, have no trouble to discern that diabolism is more than the principle of evil in the human heart personified into a symbolic devil. One of the most adroit tricks which his Satanic majesty plays is the jugglerey by which he deludes his victims into dreaming that he is non-existent. In this manner he would, if possible, deceive the very elect. Thus, if not his horns, at least his temperament sticks out in various modern issues. His success in concealing his identity is no proof that there is no synagogue of Satan in the world. Hence this last negative, logically, proves too much; it also eliminates God, and thus, like ambition, as Shakespeare says, "o'er vaults itself."

In considering the "positive elements" of the new religion, Dr. Eliot says a great many good things, but he is so saturated with the spirit of modern criticism, that he can not quite forsake the negative style. It is of the very bone and marrow of rationalists to deal in negations. The art of pulling down is their specialty. It is in upbuilding that they fail. They take away our bread and instead thereof offer us stones. However, it is one of the merits of the "new religion" that it strives to be constructive.

We know that the unlimited can not be defined and therefore we must not attempt a narrow definition of God. Neverthless, as Augustine admits, He may be conceived as being a sort of substance and certainly as having qualities, called attributes, which may be stated in certain terms. We may thus have clear, positive, definitive ideas of Him. But Dr. Eliot, like the Agnostic, who is fearful of committing himself to anything definite, takes refuge in the latitudinarian view of syncretism. The broad ideal he says, "will comprehend the Jewish Jehovah, the Christian universal Father, the modern physicist's omnipresent and

exhaustless Energy, and the biological conception of Vital Force." Surely this is accommodating enough. Under such a roof all the schools of modern thought can find shelter. But no Christian can consent to the terms "Energy" and "Force" as in any sense appositive of the Creator. These impersonal technicalities of science, like the word Providence, may express the mode by which the Preserver of the universe transmits his power through matter, or as Prof. T. G. Bonney says (Sermons by World Scholars, Vol. I, p. 186), they may be regarded as epiphanies of God, but they must not be apotheosized as equivalents of Deity. To do so is to use the language of Pantheism. Such banyan-tree theology reminds us of Pope's lines:

> "Father of all! in every age,
> In every clime adored,
> By saint, by savage, or by sage—
> Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!"

But this poetic combination of all the henotheisms of the race does not comport with the absolute religion of Jesus, which is exclusive of all impersonal and materialistic conceptions of the Father. When Paul on Mars Hill declared to the Athenians, "In Him we live and move and have our being," he and his audience were not thinking exactly of the same Entity in precisely the same way. Interpolar spaces stretched between their differing ideas, nor were they capable of coalescence. Peary says, Destiny determined that he should discover the North Pole. Who, or what, is the god, or God, so named?

One of the singular, almost amusing, habits of the age is the emphasis which is so strongly placed upon the immanence of God, as to make the impression that it is a discovery of the nineteenth century. We recall that the Deists of the eighteenth denied it, teaching that the Creator made the world, wound it up like a clock, then withdrew from it into His empyrean and not thereafter manifesting enough interest in His children to give them either a revelation or a Redeemer. But when did the Christian Church believe in an absentee God, as Dr. Lyman Abbott seems to think? Divine omnipresence always was the creed of historic Christianity, as well as of Hebraism before it (See 139 Psa.). However, at the same time, as a corrective of

Pantheism, orthodoxy insists upon the divine transcendence; that God is indeed in all things, but also above and distinct from them, His works being only His garments, the King's royal robes. But God is not all, nor is all God. (Rom. 2:20).

Dr. Eliot in consonance with his intellectual aristocracy, speaks earnestly of the divine immanence, and all but topples over into the Pantheistic camp. He says, "If God is thoroughly immanent in the entire creation, there can be no secondary causes, in either the material or the spiritual universe." With such language Spinoza would readily agree, for in his opinion, secondary causes are a delusion, having only a modal existence. Even Paul taught the divine purpose to be "that God may be all in all," (I Cor. 15:28), and that "Christ is all and in all," (Col. 3:11), but he never for a moment confused the divine personality with the divine energy, firmly holding to the transcendence and absoluteness of God in the sense that He is free from all necessity whatsoever. With these limitations we all believe in the divine immanence. But an absentee God would, after all, be better than one who is imprisoned in the universe and comes to perfection only in it. To say that he expresses Himself in his works and laws, and that He is one with them, are two thoughts with inter-stellar distances between them. The first is the language of true Monotheism, the second that of Pantheism.

Mr. John Mill said "that the notion of God's omnipotence must be given up, if God is to be kept as a religious object." Prof. Wm. James comments that "he was surely accurately right" and adds, "I believe that the only God worthy of the name must be finite." (Curr. Lit. June 1909, p. 649). Thus we soon would have only a torso of the God of revelation. Yet this is the obscurantism of our brilliant new lights, the adumbrations of our modern religious comets!

But this is digression. To return to Dr. Eliot, we want to combat several inferences which he draws from the doctrine of the divine immanence. He says, "God is so absolutely immanent in all things, animate and inanimate, that no mediation is needed between Him and the least particle of His creation." This paragraph is in perfect agreement with one that follows later on, wherein he declares that the new religion "rejects also the entire conception of man as a fallen being, hopelessly wicked, and tending downward by nature." Here we behold another

recrudescence of the old Pelagianism, the crux of the perennial atonement controversy. Surely if man has no sin, he needs no Saviour; no disease, no balm of Gilead. That which we call moral depravity and which brought Christ to the cross is not guilt by imputation as original sin any more than is the anger of the tiger, the cunning of the fox, or the rutting of the goat—it is, in fact, only the abortive remnant of man's former animal nature which has not yet been sloughed off by the process of evolution. Such is the scientific account of human sin; hence in proud self-sufficiency it utterly repudiates the necessity of vicarious penalty-bearing and the consequent imputed righteousness of Christ. With loathing it rejects justification by faith and confides in salvation by character. Yet this is the central and controling doctrine of the New Testament. Orthodoxy, however, never taught that man is "hopelessly wicked" or totally corrupt. He is salvable and capable by grace of angelic perfection. For this very purpose "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." (2 Cor. 5:19). The divine immanence, unless it is viewed as pantheistic identity with man, leaves room for an intercessor. As long as God is distinct from His creatures, a representative of both can stand between them.

All rationalists stumble at the origin of sin. They assume that they must account for it, which is not necessary. We need only accept the very apparent fact and make the best of it practically. But after eliminating all causes, except God, and rightly claiming that it can not exist uncaused, Unitarian theism, like logical Calvinism, must either consider God its author or deny it altogether. They choose the latter horn of the dilemma. But the origin of sin presents no difficulties to one who believes that the moral liberty of angels and men is perfect. God could not have created free agents in any adequate sense of the term, without allowing them the power of transgression. Otherwise they would not have been made in his own image, not free beings at all, but only highly organized animals controlled by the unchecked tyranny of their instincts—in other words, machines only a little elevated above the beast and vegetables of the field, which are utter strangers to freedom. God indeed created no Satan and no sinner, but these became such by the priceless gift of ethical liberty, an abuse which even the Almighty could have prevented only by the destruction of His highest creation.

Perhaps the first need that drives most men to religion is that of consolation in bereavement. When Dr. Eliot reaches this minor key in religious experience, he becomes pathetic. He evidently would be a poor comforter at a death-bed or a funeral. He would have little more to offer than Cato, who spent his last hours trying to cheer his soul with the consolations of philosophy. He states the case thus: "To the wretched, sick and down-trodden of the earth, religion has in the past held out hopes of future compensation. When precious ties of affection have been broken, religion has held out prospects of immediate and eternal blessings for the departed; and has promised happy reunions in another and a better world. To a human soul, lodged in an imperfect, feeble, or suffering body, some of the older religions have held out the expectation of deliverance by death, and of entrance upon a rich, competent, and happy life—in short, for present human ills, however crushing, the widely accepted religions have offered either a second life, presumably immortal, under the happiest conditions, or, at least, peace and a happy oblivion." Now the question is, "Can the new religion do so?"

He starts to give his answer by denying the supernatural and asserting that the new religion "will place no reliance on any sort of magic, or miracle, or other violation of, or exception to the laws of nature." This is a hoary argument. It goes on the pure assumption that all the laws of nature are known and that a miracle is an event that contravenes them. Modernists constantly speak of the laws of nature as though they were forces *per se*, instead of being only the *modus operandi* of energy not their own. They absolutely do nothing, are not efficient causes at all, as the Duke of Argyll demonstrates in his "Reign of Law;" they are only the manner, not even the means, by which things are done. Yet scientific devotion to them has become a cult which is paramount to pagan polytheism. But there is plenty of evidence that the supernatural, or extraordinary in physical law constantly contravenes nature. Every pumping station violates the rule that water always runs down hill or seeks its own level. The law of gravitation, one of the gods of science, is not indeed supplanted, or suspended, but successfully opposed, as Carlyle said, every time a man lifts his arm, by the miracle of human volition. If Eusapia Palladino lifts a

table without touching it with any part of her body, no spirit but her own will helping her, she is working above the ordinary laws of manipulation. So we see that the so-called supernatural is impossible only to the definitions of physical science and not to nature itself. Even Dr. Eliot acknowledges that "The line between the supposed natural and the supposed supernatural is not fixed but changeable."

Coming to the answer to the question he had raised, he says: "The new religion will not attempt to reconcile men and women to present ills by promises of future blessedness, either for themselves or for others. Such promises have done infinite mischief in the world, by inducing men to be patient under sufferings or deprivations against which they should have incessantly struggled." But this is the way the Christian martyrs overcame the Roman Empire and fulfilled the beatitude, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." Here we have the philosophy of Nietsche, who, with Lafcadio Hearn, was one of the maddest present-day haters of Christianity, and the creator of the superman, who should brook no impediment to his appetites, passions, or self-will, not be submissive to any cross or moral law, but be himself almighty. Every anarchist and atheist of Europe swears by the dictum of this insane genius.

We do not forbid the cure of ills that are remediable. Christ did not drain the bitter cup, until His self-imposed destiny demanded it. Paul practiced resignation, but also struggled against injustice until the inevitable sword fell upon his neck. Let there be medicine, anesthetics, and surgery. The Church and the hospital are not enemies, and true religion cares for the bodies as well as for the souls of men. But eternity alone makes life worth living and its necessary ills bearable. It is a future hope that adorns and cheers our path.

"Do you ask," finally says Dr. Eliot on this subject, "what consolation for human ills the new religion will offer? I answer, the consolation which often comes to the sufferer from being more serviceable to others than he was before the loss or the suffering for which consolation is needed; the consolation of being one's self wiser and tenderer than before, and therefore more able to be serviceable to human kind in the best ways; the consolation through the memory, which preserves the sweet fragrance of characters and lives no longer in presence, recalls the joys

and achievements of those lives while still within mortal view, and treasures up and multiplies the good influences they exerted."

All this is very beautiful, because it is so true. But is this all? Robert J. Ingersol said more at the grave of his brother. While the ex-President of Harvard is silent about heaven and future blessedness the eloquent skeptic believed that the departed were "better now" and said: "From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead there comes no word; but in the night of death hope sees a star and listening love can hear the rustle of a wing." In this case thus far the Agnostic strikes the higher chord of consolation.

Further on, however, Dr. Eliot redeems himself somewhat by declaring "that a loving God rules the universe. Trust in this supreme rule is genuine consolation and support under many human trials and sufferings." But this Biblical sentiment is quickly made of non-effect by the remark "that there are many physical and mental disabilities and injuries for which there is no consolation in a literal sense. Human skill may mitigate or palliate some of them, human sympathy and kindness may make them more bearable, but neither religion nor philosophy offers any complete consolation for them or ever has." Millions of believers in the consolatory promises have contradicted this pessimistic note. The conviction of future compensation, not in the sense of reward, but of readjustment of life's affairs, has made many a stony pillow soft and gave songs in the night to the early Christian martyrs.

Uhlhorn in his "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism" shows that when the old Pagan faith was dying and little but the skeleton of its ritual remained, there was a galvanic revival of moral-essay literature, men like Seneca writing beautifully of an ideal ethical life which they made no attempt to live. Faith was going and fancy was taking its place. The same is true today in all circles in which Christianity has been emasculated by that modernism which is the fruit of the destructive higher criticism. Divine sanctions having been given up, men are building the moral system which they think necessary for the preservation of society, upon such literary quicksands as their own brains have discovered. The books on ethics now issuing from the press are legion in number and enormous in bulk.

The entire scheme of national education in France (which has a host of sympathizers in America), is an attempt to inculcate virtue without God and a moral code without the Bible.

Ethical culture is to take the place of supernatural religion. An ethical society is to be a substitute for the Church. Only so much of the Decalogue is to be accepted as touches the relations of man to man and this fragment is to be regarded, not as a revealed law, but as a deduction from the principles of psychology and the evolution of ethnic customs. Only what can be erected on a scientific basis is to pass for civic and domestic and social righteousness. We are to have nothing higher in ethics, than an enlightened selfishness. We are to revert to the old Pagan hedonism. Aside from its exalted literature, the Bible as an inspired Book and Christianity as an institution are not to have any influence in the formation of character. Dr. Eliot seems to expect more social reformation and betterment of society from secret organizations and kindred bodies, than from the Church. He distinctly says the new religion is not to be bound to any "dogma, creed, or book." We are thus to have no spirit-level with which to find an even foundation for a grand ethical world-superstructure, but we are to rear it upon the apex of a pyramid. We are to have no arbiter except the panoramic human consciousness, which means our variable human feelings as they are mirrored in the dancing waves of our mercurial experience. In our day any crack-brained playwright, an Ibsen or a Bernard Shaw; any romancer, a Mrs. Humphrey Ward, or a Hall Caine; any nature student, a John Burroughs or a Haeckel; any female adventuress like Mrs. Olcott or Mrs. Eddy, or the art and literary cranks, that are too numerous to mention—all feel competent to invent new religions. In each case we are to take the *ipse dixit* of the originator of the novel cult as our theological standard. He has discarded the historic creeds and by consulting only the Delphic Python in his own soul has discovered the gospel of doubt, by whose liturgy we are to worship the unknown God and live according to a plastic moral law. To such spiritual anarchy, whose vogue it is to depose one tyrant only to set up another, usually a worse one, in his stead, Dr. Eliot has lent the influence of his name and there is rejoicing in the Bohemian camp.

While these inventors of a new faith grow eloquent over the

divine love, they hedge the divine justice, as though one was not as reasonable as the other or possibly inclusive of the other. Take away either and the perfect idea of God as an infinite Being is marred and becomes like an unsymmetrical statue. The disingenuousness of the whole tendency becomes apparent, when it is discovered that its purpose is to eliminate eternal punishment. It is astonishing with what ease these strangers to exegesis and logic can quench the penal fires of Gehenna. Dr. Eliot says: "The future religion will not undertake to describe, or even imagine, the justice of God. We are to-day so profoundly dissatisfied with human justice, although it is the result of centuries of experience of social good and ill in this world, that we may well distrust human capacity to conceive of the justice of a morally perfect, infinite being. * * The new religion cannot pretend to understand God's justice, inasmuch as there is no human experience of public justice fit to serve as the foundation for a true conception of God's."

We agree that the daily verdicts of our courts are a sad commentary on human justice. Even our Pardoning Boards are so inconsistent as to be aggravating, being unmistakably open to political and social influence. Oftentimes one criminal is executed, while another, equally guilty, escapes through a legal technicality. At best our judges, usually honest, are only fallible men and few of their deliverances receive the universal approval of the bench. But the same is true of human charity; it is a most defective quality. Is it not very singular, therefore, that a man who confessedly has no higher source of knowledge, than human experience, should be so very sure of the love of God and so very uncertain of His justice? He is ready to accept all that nature and the course of civilization teach concerning compassion, which is a reality in social economy, but distrusts his own sources with reference to the condemnation and punishment of transgression and infraction of law. But shall a man only on the side of rectitude reap as he has sown? Can one gather walnuts from the hawthorne bush? "Say ye of the righteous, that it shall be well with him; for they shall eat of the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him: for the reward of his hands shall be given him." (Isa. 3:10).

Why does not Dr. Eliot and his school abide by the conception of divine justice depicted in the Scriptures? Subjective reli-

gionists always are wiser in their own conceit, than the sacred oracles. But their gross inconsistency appears in that they accept one phase and not the other on this subject. The second life they adopt, but the second death they spurn. But logical exegesis disowns their one-sided speculation and declares that if there is not eternal perdition, neither is there eternal salvation, for the same Greek adjective (αἰώνιος) characterizes both states as being of the same quality and duration. However, we agree that neither the one nor the other forms a proper motive for the religious life. The woman, who, in ancient days, walked through the streets of Alexandria, having a torch in one hand and a pail of water in the other, crying, "With this I will burn up Heaven and with this I will extinguish Hell, so that men may serve God only from love," delivered a message that is good for all ages and lands. While in the first stages of spiritual awakening carnal moods may pertain, the regenerated soul soon casts off such skin-deep sentiments and sings:

"My God, I love Thee—not because
  I hope for heaven thereby,
Nor yet because, if I love not,
  I must forever die.
Should I not love Thee well?
  Not for the sake of winning heaven,
Or of escaping hell."

Concerning church-union Dr. Eliot pronounces the past a failure and the future hopeless and offers his own scheme as promising a better result. As far as co-operation for the good of man goes, all denominations can and often do work together. But rather than form an organic union on the basis of the new religion, they will do well to remain far apart. We never can unite around the focus of an infallible Church or around the focus of an infallible reason, but only around the focus of an infallible person, and that person Jesus the Christ, Son of God and Son of Man. Rabbi Hirsch declares that the line between the Reformed Hebrews and the Unitarians is very thin. But Christianity can unite only in Christ, not outside of Him. Ours is the absolute religion, with a thick and broad line to differentiate it from all others. The Sine Qua Non brooks no rival, and will

not be unequally yoked in a meaningless union. Truth is better and higher than fraternity and dare not be compromised. As there must be some unit as a bond of federation, the claim of Unitarianism as the rallying ground of the many divisions of faith seems plausible—one God, let all join hands under His banner, let all the rays center in that Sun! But Mohammedanism is rigidly Unitarian, yet it is split up into numerous sects. So this latest effort to unite all the various spokes of a great wheel in one golden hub also must fail.

Of course, Lutherans could not expect Dr. Eliot's religion to please them because they know at the outstart that he would ignore all real sacraments. The new religion would offer grace without means of grace. Emerson was consistent and honorable, when, as a minister, he discovered that his people looked for something more than a symbolic memorial in the Lord's Supper, he left the pulpit to become a philosopher. If the celebration of sacraments once becomes only a formal rite, they would better be discontinued altogether. But on this subject Dr. Eliot is not clear. He says "Its sacraments will be, not invasions of law by miracle, but the visible signs of a natural spiritual grace, or of a natural hallowed custom. It may preserve historical rites and ceremonies, which, in time past, have represented the expectation of magical or miraculous effects; but it will be content with natural interpretations of such rites and ceremonies." In another place he says: "Moreover, such a religion has no tendency to diminish the force in this world, or any other, of the best human imaginings concerning the nature of the infinite Spirit immanent in the universe."

Now all this is as mystical as the old mystics whom modernism is so ardently trying to resuscitate. It may mean something, anything, or nothing. We are sure, however, that the "Spirit" here mentioned is not the Holy Ghost with whom we are acquainted and that the "sacraments" here named are not the instruments of the Third Person in the Holy Trinity. Such language is more congruous with the mysticism of old Eckhart and Tauler, than with conservative Lutheranism. In the new religion Baptism and The Communion are only allegories. Thus rationalism always ends in a cloudy theosophy, ever bordering on a dreamy Ultima Thule which defies all boundaries and all

sensible definitions. What it calls sacraments are only more or less refined symbols or signs, not vehicles, of grace.

Dr. Eliot does not think his Religio Nova will become paramount as an organized body. "The great mass of the people remain attached to the traditional churches, and are likely to remain so," he says, but the new product "will progressively modify the creeds and religious practices of all the existing churches, and change their symbolism and their teachings concerning the conduct of life."

It remains to be seen how much leavening of the whole mass this small lump can effect. It has charmed the Bohemian class, artists, literateurs, sciolists, and some superior intellectuals, but no slum-workers and no pastors, who do the work of evangelists; just as Spiritualism and Christian Science have captured many idiots and charlatans of society; however, in New England, where this boasted illumination has had free course for the longest time, the result has been the melancholy ruin of Andover Seminary, the surrender of Plymouth Rock to the Vatican, and the recruiting of the ranks of infidelity from the homes of the Puritans. Wherever this thistle-down has been blown, its history has been the same. From Boston, *via* Chicago to San Francisco, the serpent's trail and sting in the bosom of the Church is seen to poison her life, to cool her zeal, to hamstring her activities, and to hide her lamp under a bushel. May the Lord help us to keep and practice the old religion.

Dr. Eliot winds up his pronuciamento with the following conclusion: "Finally, this twentieth century religion is not only to be in harmony with the great secular movements of modern society—democracy, individualism, social idealism, the zeal for education, the spirit of research, the modern tendency to welcome the new, the fresh powers of preventive medicine, and the recent advances in business and industrial ethics,—but also in essential agreement with the direct personal teaching of Jesus, as they are reported in the Gospels. The revelation he gave to mankind thus becomes more wonderful than ever."

No doubt this resume will prove a prophecy, but its fulfillment will not be according to the way its author thinks. Religion will more than ever be the hand-maid of civilization, education, and art, so far as these shall contribute to the good of men and the extension of God's kingdom among them. Christianity is not

a totally other-world religion. We will burn no Brunos, humiliate no Galileos, excommunicate no Luthers, but welcome all new discoveries, save new religions. Such a dissertation as we have been considering is not an essential or adequate exposition of the Gospel of Christ. Jesus would not recognize this twentieth century edition of his message as a true copy of the original. It does not rest upon the same foundation. "Give me a place where I may stand and I will move the world," said Archimedes. This the new religion fails to furnish for the spiritual and moral elevation of the race. Earlier Dr. Eliot had said, "The two sentiments which most inspire men to good deeds are love and hope." These are two mighty levers to lift a sinking world, provided they have a sufficient fulcrum and foothold. That fulcrum in the religion of Jesus is faith and its foothold is His empty, rocky tomb, the very things that this new concoction does not furnish, but which modernism is endeavoring to undermine as superstition. Faith, hope, charity: these three and the greatest, but not the first or fundamental, is charity. Root, flower, fruit: the greatest fruit; but this is speaking rhetorically and according to climateric values. However, scientifically, the root is the greatest, because, while it is independent of flower and fruit, they are dependent upon it. They can not possibly flourish without it, but it can glory in existence without them. So there can be no hope or love without faith. It must be first. It alone is fundamental; they are not, but are beautiful blossoms and fruit of the faith-principle that lies deep in the fertile soil of the human heart.

The claim is often made that all criticism should be sympathetic, in the sense that we should consider every man's opinion from his own standpoint. But how can we sympathize with a man who denies the Deity of Christ? A beardless professor, after a surreptitious attempt to cast doubt upon the resurrection of Jesus, in the March (1910) *Homiletic Review,* ends by saying, "The discussion of the resurrection may well be carried on, then, in the most dispassionate manner." He also agrees with Dr. George Gordon's book on "Religion and Miracle," that belief in the resurrection is not essential to "religious" life. Perhaps not, but such belief is essential to the fullest *Christian* life. For the sake of a class of people who consider themselves too brainy to accept miracles, we are to surrender Christ's historically demon-

strated resurrection. And we are to do so with unconcerned coolness! As well might the men of his day have expected Napoleon to have remained nonchalant, if some one had proposed that he should dispense with his highly prized cannon. By the resurrection we have won our Wagrams and Austerlitzes. Without it we should long ago have met our Waterloo. Yet on the eve of a grand movement for the world's evangelization we are asked to throw our chief weapon on the scrap pile! No; let us keep on bombarding the enemy with the old ordnance that served us so well in the past. This is no time for parley, but for battle and victory. Confucius, with his all-this-world philosophy, was very little behind the "new religion." The Pharisees and Sadducees would not have crucified Jesus, if He had so taught. But now, as then, and always the case is as He put it, when He said: "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes; yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in Thy sight." (Matt. 11:25, 26).

York, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE DEPARTED SOULS.

BY REV. FRED. S. GEESEY.

On this subject bearing on eschatology, the teaching of Jesus, the Christ, and His Apostles must give us the needed information. Hence, the state of the departed souls is a Christian doctrine which we do and must accept on the teaching of revelation only.

In the consideration of such a theme, we must take it for granted that man is immortal. This presumption is organically included in the Old and the New Testaments. Man, by his creation, is lifted up above all other ranks of earth's creatures and is made in the image and "likeness of God." Hence, man is a moral and spiritual personality—a being of free-will, and intelligence, capable of thinking God's own thoughts after Him and holding ethical and spiritual fellowship with the Creator. Therefore, because of this Godhood in manhood, this divine expiration becoming man's inspiration, man is immortal.

Or as Elihu in Job 33:4 says: "The spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life." The sad story of Scripture is also that *man,* because of sin, in consequence of the fall of our first parents and our present sinful state of nature, is mortal and death comes and dissolves this habitat of the soul, this sanctuary of the Spirit, this enshrinement of Deity, and we stand by the open graves and say, when the body is laid in the grave, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust." Or as Ecclesiastes 12:7 has it: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." Or as Job 14:10 puts it: "But man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Hence, because of sin, death comes and terminates this present bodily life. When this dissolution of the personal union between the body and soul and the consequent resolution or resolving of the body into its physical elements takes place, we find human death to be a separate problem from the death of other creatures. Other creatures die and remain dead as far as we

have any knowledge or revelation on that subject, *but* the human body, this mortal shall put on immortality, and shall rise again. Since Jesus, the Christ, is "become the first fruits of them that slept," His resurrection from the dead is the beginning of a work that shall only end when once the body of every child of God has been raised from its place of rest and brought home to glory. Thus physical death awaits us all. Yet, to the believing soul, death is not an unforgiven penalty; because in the progress of salvation, the believer is lifted above its sting and fear, and death itself is made the gateway to the presence of the Lord and "the rest remaining." And when our body shall rise, death is wholly destroyed to the believer, while to the unbeliever and rejecters of salvation, death remains the unrepealed penalty of continued sin. Thus "man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" This is then the question: Where are the dead? What is the present state of the departed souls? The revealed teachings of Christ give us an *intermediate* state with two different conditions of the departed in that intermediate state. Presuming that the soul is immortal and teaching that it is so, it lives on after the dissolution between the body and soul has taken place. The soul may live in a state of spiritual death or in a state of spiritual happiness, yet in continued existence. We confess, in studying this subject, we find and meet with questions of great difficulties. But the Scripture assertions bearing on our topic, are sufficient for our faith, and open to speculative minds many problems to which varied answers are given. Our aim is to mark the chief points of truth assured us by the Scriptures.

First. As to the present state of the departed wicked and unbelieving. We believe and therefore teach that such souls are already suffering the penal consequences of sin. John 3:36, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

Our Savior has given Himself into death on Golgotha's cross for human sin and guilt. By that vicarious sacrifice of Jesus, the Christ, His obedience and suffering were in place and instead of ours and become the only ground on which the sinner is accepted of God. Hence, God through Christ's death on the cross, is propitiated and human guilt is expiated and cancelled. Ro-

mans 8:1-4, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, etc."

To the unbelievers and rejecters of Christ and His salvation, the curse or condemnation, in consequence of the fall in sin and a life in sin, still abides and is to such in effect as though Christ Jesus had not died to satisfy divine justice and righteousness. Hence, such unbelieving, wicked, grace-rejecting souls separated from the body, abide under the retributive action in which sin works eternal death. The soul as a spirit-unit, dissolved from the body, but surviving the body, is in a state of spiritual death. Christ's teaching of the ungodly rich man in the parable compels us to say that he lived, after his demise, and found the result and fruitage of his life in sin to be immediate misery. Lazarus at Dives' door and under his eye, had been his final trial, and his neglect of the poor the last drop that had made the cup of God's long-suffering to run over. Dives sought to save his life by faring "sumptuously every day," but lost it when his flattering dreams of ease and self-enjoyment by death awakened him in the awful and terrible realities of eternity. The fruitage and immediate effect of Dives' life was remorse in *Hades.* Of Judas the betrayer of our Savior, it is said in Acts 1:25, "That he might go to his *own* place." We are not sufficiently told to what *place* Judas went. We know Judas fell, or rather threw himself by deserting and betraying his master, from the place of an Apostle, of which he was unworthy,—and all "that he might go to his own place." This place of course was that of a traitor, which was not only the gibbet, but the place and state fitted for him and he for it,—hell. The supposition and teaching of Peter in his assertion is that the place and state of misery was "his own place." Therefore Jesus says of Judas in Matt. 26:24, "It had been good for that man if he had not been born." It is surely not worth while to be born into this world to go out of it finally and end in eternal misery. This is worse than not being. But God's children shall finally leave this world and enter a state and place of everlasting blessedness and happiness, and for all such it is worth while to have "been born." Heaven will make amends for all the sorrows and miseries of earth. "Earth has no sorrows that heaven cannot cure." In this intermediate state of the wicked departed souls, though they are lost and suffer already the penal consequences of unchecked sin,

there "is a stage of advance through the resurrection to condemnation."

While in this present state of misery, the wicked departed spirits will have, it seems, a tormenting prospect of the happiness of others. Thus Dives, in the parable, is represented as "seeing Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom." This sight aggravated his misery as it would that of a man perishing with hunger to see others feasting, but could himself not come to the feast. Or as Christ teaches in Luke 13:28, "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." Thus the present state of the departed wicked is that they now remember, with what contempt they treated serious piety and religion, and in vain will they wish to be in the place and state of those whom they once despised. It is remorse and the beginning of hell itself when they think for what they have lost their immortal souls. If such be the present state of the wicked departed souls, what added torment and increased rage and fury must be their state when they advance in misery through resurrection to condemnation. Let Jesus, the Christ, give the decision in Matt. 25:46: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

Second. The present state of the departed believers. This state is one of happiness with the Lord. We are safe in saying this without human fancy and inventive fabrication. St. Paul makes absence from the body equivalent to presence with the Lord. In Phil. 1:23, Paul says, "I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ." Poor Lazarus was carried to Abraham's bosom, and his soul was there in a state of happiness. Lazarus, or the person or soul whom Christ means by the parable, was perfectly conscious of his condition, that it was a changed and happy state into which he had come. The penitent thief on the cross was to be with Christ in Paradise the very hour or day of his death. In Rev. 6:9 John sees "under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held." Those martyrs, slain because they were God's witnesses on earth, are spoken of as present in the worship of heaven. Even such in heaven, the spirits of the just made perfect, "retain a proper resentment of

the wrong they have sustained by their cruel enemies." The honor of God, and of Christ and the Gospel demand a just recompense of reward. We believe there is joy, even in heaven, at the just punishment and destruction of the inexorable enemies of Christ and Christianity, as well as at the conversion of sinners. All these blood-washed souls spoken of by St. John were there in a state of happiness, without their bodies, yet in perfect personal consciousness and possessing their true personal faculties of knowledge and enjoyment. While the present state of the departed believing souls is one of personal consciousness and happiness, this present felicitous state differs from the ultimate condition or state, in this, that, in this present state, the departed souls *await* the full redemption of the body through the resurrection.

I Cor. 15:53, 54. "This corruptible must put," etc. Thus our departed loved ones who have died or departed in the faith are happy now, and are truly saved, and established in the principles of holiness. Yet the crowning blessing, happiness and benediction of redeeming love shall take place, when "the trumpet shall resound, and the Lord shall descend," then the souls of the believing shall enter the resurrected body, and in union of soul and body they will enter upon the full and ineffable fruition of heaven.

We have not entered into a discussion of the varied theories about the intermediate state, nor shall we speak of Rome's whole realm of souls divided into various *receptacula*. Let it suffice to say, that the whole teaching of Romanism on *limbus patrum, limbus infantum* and purgatory is nothing more than a human fabrication and merely ecclesiastical, and the Scriptures quoted for Rome's substantiation afford us no warrant for its self-made scheme. We as Protestants and as Lutherans must reject the scheme of Rome as in direct conflict with the doctrine of justification by faith.

Third. The present state of the departed souls in relation to an opportunity of grace. The question with many is, whether the fate of the countless multitudes of mankind dying without any knowledge of Christ and His Gospel is closed with this earthly probation. Also whether the state and fate of those neglecting or rejecting salvation is closed when they die, or whether a second chance will be afforded such.

There are some devout and scholarly men who contend for a second probation, a *post mortem* probation, and assert that such who have died in ignorance of the Christ and His Gospel shall have a *post mortem* chance to accept salvation. Others claim that even those having wilfully rejected the offered redemption shall have a second chance.

This theory or teaching alleges that no person will be finally judged until he has had a chance to accept salvation through a fair knowledge of the Savior. One of the chief or main passages of Scripture used by *Progressive Theology* is that of I Peter 3:18-22: We humbly confess this is one of the most enigmatical portions of holy writ, and not easily explained, but on fair exegesis no one can prove a second probation from the intended teaching of that passage. If Christ preached personally in Hades or to "the spirits in prison," which is the most generally defended interpretation, He did not offer grace to such as had no previous opportunity but to such who "were disobedient" when called. If it was an offer of mercy in prison or Hades, it was a *second* offer to rejecters of grace, because there is no hint of its acceptance, neither from I Peter 4:6, nor Matt. 12:31-32, nor from Phil. 2:9-11, or Col. 1:19:20, can such certainty of a future probation in Hades be drawn. A second chance or *post mortem* probation is not the Gospel message of Christ Jesus nor of His inspired Apostles. But the teaching of the Gospel is that God through Jesus Christ has provided salvation, forgiveness of sin, and all its means thereto,—"a provision in which both its nature and design, all men may be saved on condition of repentance and faith." Now in the day of grace "is the accepted time." "Now is the day of salvation." The business of salvation is a present one. Isaiah 55:1-3, "Ho, every one that thirsteth," etc. Matt. 11:28-30, "Come unto Me all ye that labor," etc. Rev. 3:20, "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man," etc. Rev. 22:17, "And the Spirit and the Bride say come," etc. Matt. 23:37, "Oh, Jerusalem," etc. Heb. 2:3, "How shall we escape, etc.?" Thus we might go on and quote many, many passages of similar bearing as the reader well knows. Unbelief in Jesus, the Christ, as their own personal Savior is the one great condemning sin of mankind to-day, as it was in Christ's day. To be temporarily and eternally saved

we must repent of sin, comply with the conditions of salvation and accept Christ Jesus by faith now.

"Go ye into all the world." Now in this day of grace we are to go and preach the Christ. The true exegesis of Scripture everywhere in the Bible points to death as the closing of human probation. The state of the wicked after death is fixed and is so declared in the Word.

The door to the foolish five Virgins was shut. Not that God closed the door on them, but their own spiritual lethargy and neglect to known duty closed the door upon the foolish Virgins. Jerusalem did not know the day of its visitation, though Christ preached and wept over it. The ungodly rich man would have gladly changed his state or condition had he had a chance to do so. He prayed to have it changed, but his prayer was not answered as he prayed. He still prays for a drop because he denied the crumb. The other character of the parable, Lazarus, is still happy and blessed and shall continue to be so forever.

Many other Bible incidents and passages of Scripture could be treated and quoted to show that not a single explicit assurance of a human probation or extension of it is found in the Word to give comfort to those lost in the intermediate state. If the countless multitudes of heathen who died without a knowledge of the Gospel and the plan of salvation are saved, they are saved because Christ Jesus "tasted death for every man." Not on their merit or comparative innocency can such or any be saved, but because Christ is "the propitiation for the sins of the world."

Dr. Christleib, in "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," p. 115, says: "Scripture nowhere teaches that all who die without knowledge of the revelation of God through Christ are irretrievably lost. It is one thing innocently not to *know,* it is quite another thing wilfully to reject. The express teaching of God's Word is that men will be judged hereafter according to their works and knowledge, and that the measure of such judgment will be the degree of revelation, supernatural and natural vouchsafed to them in this present life." The sad, unfortunate state and circumstances in which the heathen especially are placed seem, to many, to demand at least, a great hope, that their dying without the Gospel and knowledge of Christ, shall give them a second or rather their first chance to accept or reject the Savior. But all such teaching can at best be but a seeming justifiable

pity or inference taken from the general love and justice of God, as conceived of by man. There is a great deal of teaching and preaching in our day that is an insult to the moral sense, and causes the Word preached to lose hold on men. Shall we not say that all will be judged according to the light, natural or supernatural, they have had. And on the basis of an actual atonement in Jesus, the Christ for the sins of the whole world, there will be not only a *just* but a merciful judgment "which," says Dr. Valentine, in his notes on "Outlines in Theology," p. 261, "may accept even such as knew Him not, if they have lived according to the light given them." There are men, and many of them, without the Bible or Gospel, but none without God. Obedience to given light shows the submissive disposition ready to move into the higher obedience of faith when the truth comes.

There may be implicit faith, waiting to become explicit faith. We have an example of this in Abraham, Rom. 4:9-11. In this case we have *Faith* reckoned to Abraham for righteousness when he was still in an uncircumcised state. Circumcision to Abraham was the seal of righteousness. Abraham was a good Lutheran before his circumcision. Implicit faith, or obedience to given light, he had, until the true light came and created explicit faith.

The whole world is under a mediatorial probation now, not after the death of mankind. It is our imperative business to give the heathen the Gospel, or else we may not have as good a chance of being saved as they have. Capernaum did less than Sodom would have done with equal opportunities of salvation. But if the heathen or any of them be saved without the Gospel and a knowledge of Christ, they are so saved not because there is a *post mortem* probation, but because Christ Jesus, the God-man, is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.

Since Christ has suffered for the sins of the human race, the heathen sustain an open relation to forgiveness. The human heart was made for God and cannot rest without Him.

Spring Forge, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

GLIMPSES OF EARLY LUTHERAN THEOLOGY.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D.

Between the theological beginnings of Luther and the Concordia Book of 1580, lies a period of intensest interest. In it, when understood, are to be found in essentials the fixed and final elements of Lutheran doctrine. Therefore every path made across these fields is of more than momentary interest. Specially is this true when the pathfinder is himself no novice in the matter. This is the case in a noteworthy degree respecting the modernized summary presented to the Church in Professor Tschackert's "Origin of Lutheran Doctrine." ("Entstehung der Lutherischen und Reformierten Kirchenlehre." Professor P. Tschackert Ordentlich Professor of Theology, Gottingen. Vandershoeck und Ruprecht. 1910).

In the development of Lutheran doctrine from Luther's death to the Book of Concord, Prof. Tschackert, after discussing the various controversies which ran so high and threw so lurid a light on the acerbities of the theological discussions, gives an analysis of the Church Regulations which from time to time were issued by the different German principalities and municipalities which had embraced the Reformation and now needed to give it form and validity in their respective sphere of influence and especially in their own legal bounds. ("Tschackert, pages 572-620).

These regulations, styled "Kirchenordnungen" or Agenda, were many and of varied worth. They have not all been given their proper place as aids to the understanding of the later Lutheran doctrine and documents, for the simple reason that up to date there is no complete exhaustive edition of these State papers. (The work is now being done by Sehling. Die Kirchenordnungen des XVI Yahrhundert). Tschackert has collated them and here and there furnishes us the definitions and the explanations which they give of elemental Lutheran doctrine, and to which they held both their teachers and pastors.

Following in the main his narrative, I have drawn out some

of these facts as illustrations of our doctrinal growth through an era of great disturbance, but also of high theological fecundity and profound moral earnestness.

The work of the theologians produced the doctrines of Lutheranism and Calvinism, but the theologians would have labored in vain had the results of this toil not been publicly acknowledged. Tschackert insists that one may set up the theory that the truth must be self-perpetuating whether or not it is legalized, but practically it does not so work out; for, although the Reformers had perfect confidence in the truth of their doctrine and teaching, yet had the authorities of Germany and Switzerland declared against them, they in all probability would have had the same untimely fate as befell the Protestantism of Italy, France and Spain. But in Germany and Switzerland the Reformation was protected by the authorities through the means of Kirchenordnung.

These Kirchenordnung had to do with cultus, relation of the Church to State, and more especially with the teaching or doctrine.

The first of these Church Orders were regulations for Church service. They had their beginning in 1527 in Luther's "Formula Missae" which was prepared for the Wittenberg Church and introduced the evangelical conception of the Lord's Supper; then followed at once also his "Tanflbuchlein." Short use of these brought about the first Lutheran Order of Church Service for the Dukedom of Prussia. It was composed by Luther's three friends, Brieszmann, Speratus and Poliander, but given out with the authority of the two Evangelical Bishops Polentz and Quiesz under the title "Artikle der Ceremonnium und anderer Kirchenordnung." It regulated Church Services and congregational life.

In 1526 there followed from Wittenberg, Luther's "Deutsche Masse und Ordnung der Gottesdienstes," a liturgical writing "which was fundamental for the Church Service Orders of all Lutheran Churches."

It had also importance through Luther's conception of the merely relative value of such liturgical services in general, Luther saying in the preface: "Before all things I beg all who use this our Order of Service, that they make out of it no necessary law nor thereby entangle any one's conscience." He sends it

out because he believes it will aid the real "matter"—the cause of the Gospel—and because he has heard of the difficulties which have arisen through the heterogeneous services used.

Then comes the "Kirchenordnung fur Schwabisch und das Hallische Land," outlined by Brenz, also in 1526. A number of others followed, but in 1528 there was a really epochal advance in the "Unterricht der Visitationen in Kurfurchentum Sachsen." These were prepared by Melanchthon. They were his famous Visitation Articles, and were issued with the approval of Luther. Here for the first time in connection with the service there is a Lehrordnung or regulation for instruction which has to do chiefly with confession, faith and good works. This work of Melanchthon's was a pioneer and exercised decisive weight upon a whole series of following Kirchenordnungen. Though a number were not independent, notably Bugenhagen, 1528; Hamburger 1529; Lubecker 1531; Schleswig-Holsteiner 1542, and others mostly more or less under the influence of Bugenhagen. These all were issued with special reference to pedagogical motives, teaching the children through the catechism and the congregations by the preaching of the Word. They had no special development of doctrine.

Melanchthon's Visitation Articles, on the contrary, began at once to bear fruit along doctrinal lines. First through the Predigt-Anmerkung of Herzog Ernst the Confessor in 1535. Duke Ernst noticed that many preachers were unskilled in the new teaching. Already in 1529 he had issued a "Short Sketch, What They Shall Teach." It emphasized repentance and forgiveness of sin; the law to be preached to awaken repentance; the sin forgiven through Christ, and eternal life certain through Him. Both forgiveness and life alone are through Christian faith. Faith is thus presented in truly evangelical way. Quite a full analysis follows, touching upon relation of the individual to the State; prayer; freedom and the doctrine of the Sacraments.

Two striking Ordnungen came into view at the first. The Kirchenordnung of the State of Hanover of 1536, and the Lippische Kirchenordnung of 1538. Hanover by the payment of four thousand gold gulden to their Catholic overlord had received the right of religious freedom. At once Urbanus Rhegius, the Superintendent, prepared for the cities a Kirchenord-

nung. It discusses first what the true Church is, in order to meet the Catholic charge of a falling away of the faith. It showed how Christianity had its form and being since the time of the apostles; how then the Evangelical movement in Germany had begun, insisting that those called Lutherans and who had confessed their faith at Augsburg had never separated from the true Church, but only from its base leaven of Pharisees and Sadducees. "There is a great difference between separation from false prophets and from the true Church. We do not leave the Church. God forbid. We do not reject all we have found in it, only that which is contrary to the Gospel. We believe also in a universal Christian Church, as wide as the world, which we love and honor as our true mother. But the voice of our Shepherd, that shall we hear."

The Lippische Ordnung was examined and approved by Luther, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen and Melanchthon as "right and Christian." This sets forth in the case of each matter spoken of the false teachings of Rome, and then by way of contrast, the right teaching of the Gospel. "The Gospel is a joyous message of the forgiveness of sin. Through the Gospel is man blessed. Through the Gospel, which is received by faith, we are renewed, receive the Holy Spirit and do good works."

With regard to free will is taught: "According to Holy Scriptures the natural man is, before being born again through the Holy Spirit, in divine things, blind. Therefore is the Holy Spirit and the grace of Christ according to Scriptures, first necessary."

True faith is this, that "We have sure, certain, undoubting trust in God, that He is gracious to us....will forgive our sins through Christ out of grace alone, apart from all works and laws, and make us righteous through Christ the Son of God." This faith produces two results: "First it changes and justifies heart and life, which brings peace with God and the Holy Ghost, who works in the hearts of believers; further, it produces all sorts of good works." This faith is a gift of God. "It arises from the preaching and hearing of the Word of God through the inworking of the Holy Spirit."

Good works "are those which....have God's Word and command, such as please Him on account of our Lord Christ. That is works which takes place out of faith." "The motives of good

works are three: First, Obedience to God's command; second, that others may be incited to the same; and third, that a Christian may thereby strengthen his faith and make certain his hope." Yet dare all these works not be reckoned as merit, since they are really workings of the Holy Ghost in the believer.

In the section on Church Service, we have the definition of the Church. "The Christian Church is a spiritual body of all the chosen and believing scattered over all the world who believe in Christ, use the Confession of Baptism and Sacrament, whose Head is Christ and they His body.....In spiritual matters under the thrall of none other than Christ alone...."

Returning to the Brandenburg-Nurnburg Kirchenordnung, we notice it is in two parts: First, a doctrinal and service section; then a series of catechism or children's sermons. There were many copies and editions of this Kirchenordnung, among others by Osiander and Johann Brenz.

Above all, the very purpose of this Order is to be a teaching or doctrinal order. It discusses, therefore, law and Gospel, sin and repentance. Characteristic is the presentation of the Gospel as "the preaching of the satisfying and saving activity of Christ." "The Gospel is nothing other than a good joyous message of our dear Lord Jesus Christ."

As a Mediator, "He directs all His life according to the will of the Father, does for us what we were indebted to do for ourselves, fulfills the law and all righteousness for us." This is satisfaction through active obedience. Besides, He takes upon Himself all our sins and suffers all that which should have been our retribution. That is passive obedience.

Finally, "He prays for us poor sinners that God will receive us into grace"—that is Christ's intercession for us. (Rom. 8:1; Heb. 5.) After Christ through obedience, suffering and intercession has wrought for us, and thereby as the Exalted One has become Lord over all, He works with us. This last phase of the thought is developed strongly according to the Osiandrian view of Justification.

Through the preaching of the Gospel, Christ perfects the work of our justification. "The Gospel brings us first forgiveness of sin and thereby in our conscience peace." Further the Gospel brings us the Righteousness of Christ and makes it our own so that we may take the same and comfort ourselves as that it hap-

pened for us, was presented to us, and is as though we had ourselves done it."

This justification stands upon these two chief points, forgiveness of sin and the gift of Christ's Righteousness which is received through faith. "Such justification should make its recipients active servants of the Father, lest again they trust in their own works."

Further, and this has an Osiandrian tinge, the Gospel brings Christ Himself in the heart of the believer, and not Christ only, but also the Father and the Holy Ghost. Fourth: We are through the Gospel new born. Further here follows, after such new birth, also a new life, for the Holy Spirit sheds into our our hearts. But love fulfills the law and out of it spring all sorts of good fruits.

Baptism is accounted a work of God on the baptized. Baptism of necessity is permitted to be performed by laity. The blessing of woman after child-birth is done away with as a bit of superstition, as though woman by becoming a mother was in any way profaned. In this order of baptism preceeding the Renunciato diaboli there occurred exorcisms.

With reference to the Lord's Supper, Book 38 of this Order makes Lutheran explanation, doing away with the Romish offering idea. Church garments are retained "in order that the server of the church should not always be in their own garments, so that they might serve their congregations in all bravery and honesty," For simplicity, however, the Church soon came to use the cope only.

The pastors were admonished that they upon the salvation of their souls should proceed with all care to perform their offices, and the laity also were urged to "receive their pastors as shepherds of the soul, and hold them in all honor." The pastors were to act in accordance with the Visitationsordnung. Where doubt or difficulty arose, an appeal was to be made to the authorities. At the close there was noted with modesty a method of procedure where the articles might prove insufficient. It was that the pastors "should act according to the Divine Word, and diligently pray our Lord God that He might grant His grace and graciously communicate to us eternal salvation."

The Wurtemburg Ordnung in the year 1535 depended largely upon the above. It brought out a "common church Order as it

was to be held everywhere throughout the Principality of Wurtemberg." It was composed by Schnepf and experted by Brenz. In this Order of Church Service there was no special presentation of doctrine. "It might be of need," said the introduction, "that we give a form of doctrine and teaching as well as of ceremonies, seeing that the former is of so much greater weight." They, however, consider that evangelical doctrine is already sufficiently known to save them this task. Tschackert says that the tone of the articles was that of a Lutheran colored Biblicism.

Another order published in 1540 also depended largely on the Brandenburg-Nurnburg Ordnung. This was the Kirchenordnung of the Mark-Brandenburg. In the section "of the Doctrine" we read: "The pure faith is not without knowledge of sin and repentance." Now just "here is the chief article and sum of the whole Gospel, that clear and pure, irrespective of all human antagonism must be taught and held even to death, this, namely, that we obtain in forgiveness of sins, justification and finally eternal salvation, out of the pure grace of God, alone through faith in the redemption of Christ, without addition of the worthiness of our works, desert, neither, on account of the worthiness of our sorrow or repentance." Fruits must follow. Where they do not, there the really true faith has not come into the heart.

The second part contains the Kinderpredigten. The third part is devoted to ceremonies as well as to "the use of the Holy revered Sacrament." This Ordnung has as its characteristic that in matters of ceremonial it held to many old Catholic ways as far as "they were not apart from the Divine Word." The policy was probably accentuated by the political friendliness of the Kurfurst Joachem II, of Brandenburg for the Emperor. At baptism chrism and salt were retained as symbols for spirit and wisdom, a white garment as symbol of innocence, and the burning torch in the hand of the baptized as a type of Christian belief.

In the Lord's Supper administered in both forms, the elevation was retained, though done away with previously in Wittenberg. Visiting the sick took the place of extreme unction. But if the priest carried the sacrament into a house the Kuster must precede him with bell and lantern. Marriage of priests was permitted. The power of the Bishop was retained. A sketch

of this Order was presented to Luther for his approval and by him permitted to pass. He judged the free preaching of the Gospel, the evangelical teaching of penitence and faith, of justification and good works, the dispensing of the Supper in both forms, and the marriage of priests of so great worth that the Catholic remnants in the ceremonies might easily take care of themselves. "If your Lord the Kurfurst," wrote he, December 4, 1539, to Probst Buchholzer, "is not satisfied with one cope, then let him put on three like Aaron the High Priest; and if his grace the Kurfurst is not satisfied with his processional and the singing and ringing, then let him go seven times around as Israel did at Jerico; and if your Lord the Margrave has the desire, then let his Kurfurstly Grace go on ahead with leaping and dancing, with harp and symbol as David did before the Ark of the Lord. For such things, if kept from real abuses, give to or take from the Gospel nothing at all. Yet see that out of them be not made something necessary for salvation and the conscience thereby be bound."

We next come to the "Kallenberger Ordnung" of 1542. It consisted of four parts, of which the first had to do with teaching and doctrine, and is thus introduced: "Christian, permanent and in the Scriptures and Holy Fathers well grounded explanations and interpretations of the chief articles of our true old Christian religion given out in print for poor, plain pastors."

The work was done by Corvinus, and he had evidently before him the general line of thought of the preceding articles. But Corvinus is a master teacher and he has worked out this new Order with great clearness and sharp divisions and subdivisions. He puts first Scripture proofs, and next in order sets the ideal church fathers. God will have His Word alone preached. As to faith, it "is worked in us by the Spirit out of the Word as a real confidence in Christ and His promises, namely, that we have come to grace on account of His merit, shall receive forgiveness of sins and be justified before God." "All his sins are forgiven the believer out of grace, without addition of his own works, and the righteousness which is accepted with God for Christ's sake is given him." Expressly is the sola fide principle maintained.

"In matters of justification all works, also works of the law are excluded." "Yet good and proper Christian works are in no wise forbidden, but are to be most diligently taught according to

the manner of the Scriptures as fruits of Christian penitence." But only "what God Himself demands and asks of us to the honor of His name and the furtherance of His glory, that call we good works." An interesting statement after the manner of Luther follows as to the care of the poor: "Native, pious, poor, sick and delinquent persons shall be cared for. Foreign beggars and beggar-monks (and here one can see the touch of resentment against the begging friars of Peter's pence) are not to be suffered in the country; for we do not have God's command that lazy folks shall be supported to be a burden to the Church in their laziness. Rather saith the Scripture, 'If any will not work, neither let him eat.' 2 Thess. 3:10."

Following in the line of the preceding and like it with strong dependence on Melanchthon's "Visitation Articles" is the Kalner Kirchenordnung, or Reformation. It is composed of "simple thoughts upon which a Christian Reformation grounded in the Word of God is to be built," and was a brilliant defense of the new faith, against the prevailing scholastic Catholicism of Kolm. Preachers are taught "that all preaching is to be directed to our Lord Christ."

In the matter of justification, where the Osiardrian thought of the Brandenburg Order had said, "the Gospel brings Christ Himself truly into the believing heart," we have here Melanchthon's thought expressed, "when also the conscience, in terror before God's wrath comforts itself with the Gospel and knowledge of the Savior Christ and the gracious promise given on His account, so is the Holy Spirit there and works in this struggle a sure confidence and trust in the heart, so that the Holy Spirit is given to men through faith."

This is the only Order depending on Nurnburg which has an article on the Church. The idea of the "invisible church" is put in the background according to Melanchthon's later view, and all emphasis placed on the "visible church." The visible church and assembly of God in this life is the congregation who truly believe God's Word commanded us through Christ and the apostles, and who through the Holy Ghost are born anew." Good and bad are mixed. "God's Word and the Sacraments, although they be dispensed by sinful persons, are yet strong from the grace of God and the work of Christ."

The Church is to be known by three signs. These three ar-

ticles leave somewhat the Luther-Melanchthon type. First is the right teaching, pure doctrines as given by Christ and the apostles. Second, the right use of the sacraments which Christ ordained. Third, confession of the right teaching in calling upon God and in Christian discipline and obedience to the ministers.

Of the Supper, is taught according to the views of Melanchthon "that the Lord truly presents and gives His flesh and blood, through the service of the Church, in the Holy Supper with the visible signs bread and wine, not as food for the natural and temporal, but as food for the spiritual and eternal life."

In 1552 the "Mecklenberg Order" was published—an order how the procedure is to be—"As regards the Christian doctrines, dispensing of sacraments, ordination, orderly ceremonies in the Church, visitations, consistory and schools."

Its first part is concerning doctrines, in reference to which the articles say: "There is no other intention in the writing than that there shall be forwarded the one eternal true teaching of the Gospel which God has graciously revealed through His Son Jesus Christ which inheres in the writings of apostles and prophets, and which is expressed in the understanding of the Apostles', Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, with which agree Luther's Catechism and Confession, (Reference here is to Luther's Confession of 1528 entitled, "The Confession of Articles of Faith against the enemy of the Gospel and all sorts of Heretics. Martin Luther) and the Augsburg Confession."

Justifying faith is at once a knowledge with regard to the articles of belief and holding the same as true, in which is enclosed the promise of the grace of Christ, to which all articles are directed as to an end, as well as "a truly hearty trust in the Son of God, Jesus Christ the Mediator and Reconciler, that we on His account and through Him have forgiveness of sins, grace and salvation."

The three signs of the true church are the pure teaching of the Gospel, the right use of the sacraments, and obedience to the preaching office.

There now follow the "Wurtemburg Order" of 1553; the "Pfalz-Neuburg" 1554; the "Sein-Wittgenstein" 1555; the "Waldeck" 1556; the "Saxon General Articles" 1557, and the "Pfalz-Zweihrucken" 1557.

In the first, by Brenz, the sacraments are discussed along Lutheran lines, and the doctrine of transubstantiation denied.

"The right understanding of the Scriptures is by Scripture itself, and by those who through Scriptures are awakened."

All of these last named Orders refer to the Augsburg Confession, some of them also to other Reformation articles, as the Apology, the Saxon Confession, Luther's Catechism, Melanchthon's "Examination for the Ordained," the Schmalcald Articles, and Melanchthon's "Loci Theologici."

"The Great Wurtemburg Church Ordnung" appeared in 1559, and was followed shortly by a series of others of like general character. The Wurtemburg Order was based on the Wurtemburg Confession of 1552, previously mentioned.

Previously in the Duchy of Prussia there began a trend toward a more positive Lutheranism. Its result was incorporated in the Repetitio Corporis doctrinae ecclesiasticae, or a "Repetition of the Sum and Content of the right general Christian doctrine as the same is drawn from the Word ofGod, set forth in the Augsburg Confession, Apology and Schmalcald Articles....." 1567.

Two Lutheran Bishops issued an Order in 1544 (Bishops Morlin and Venediger), an interesting feature of which is its preface, which declares that "Church Orders such as this are no necessary matters, and we are not thereby bound in our consciences; but they only serve toward a becoming discipline and good order."

A most weighty Kirchenordnung is that of "Braunschweig Luneberg" issued in 1569 by Duke Julius. This Order continued in use in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hanover up to 1900. It is the joint product of Superintendent Martin Chemnitz and Chancellor Jacob Andrea, and has great doctrinal value.

The basis of all Church Service is pure doctrine. It is taken from the Canonical Holy Scriptures, the Ecumenic Symbols (Apostolicum, Nicaeum, and Athanasianum) "for these same symbols are not outside of or antagonistic to the Scriptures, but are in their right, proper understanding, the very strength and sap of the Holy Divine Scriptures. Further the Augsburg Confession whose articles of the present time are right fine, pure, well founded symbols of the Evangelical Church, is to be received

according to the understanding of the Apology, the Schmalcald Articles, the Catechism and other writings of Luther."

Justification is defined "as the ranking doctrine of Christianity, which serves for the clear, right understanding of the entire Scriptures, and alone opens the door to the whole Bible, without which article, no poor conscience has a proper, permanent confidence or may know the riches of the Grace of God."

The sum of the pure doctrine is that "We are alone from grace righteous before God, on account of the obedience and death of Christ, through faith, without the addition of our renovation, obedience, or good works. The latter follow certainly, but they belong not to this article, how and by what means man is righteous before God and blessed." The objective ground of our justification lies alone in Christ "in order that the sole merit may be the obedience, sufferings and death of Christ, which out of pure grace is applied to us in Word and Sacrament alone through faith."

On the Sacrament, Chemnitz guards alike against Catholic and individualist. "We believe," continues Chemnitz, "what He says, but the 'modum' of its happening we commend to Him who has said it."

An interesting feature is the abbreviation of the Apostolic Creed by the omission of "conceived of the Holy Ghost," "suffered under Pontius Pilate," and "of God the Father Almighty." This is to be referred to inadvertence rather than dogmatic design.

Then follows the "Lippische Order" of 1571, the "Austrian" of 1571, the "Oldenberger" 1573, "Pommeranian" 1574, the "Hessian" 1574, "Luneberg" 1575, "Nassan, Sarbrücken" 1576, and the "Hohenhohe" of 1578.

In answer to the question, "What pertains then to the justification of the sinner before God?" the Oldenberg Ordnung reports, "There belong three things, neither without the other justifying man before God: First, the pure grace of God; second, the perfect obedience and merit of the Lord Christ; the third is faith."

In view of all this the children are accustomed to say in the Catechism:

"Gott giebts,
Christ erwirbts,

Der heilige Geist bestatigts.
Das Wort Verkundigts
Der Glaube empfangts
Die Sacramente versiegelen's
Gute Werke bezeugen's."

Finally we have the "Kursachson Kirchenordnung" of the year 1580, the year of the Concordia. It is a work of Andrae. "God's Word is the norm, measure and rule according to which all church and school officials must always direct their preaching and teaching." It is to be explained in the understanding of the Augustana but "only by the first old invariata." "Owing to the many cloakings of impure teaching there is necessary a proper classification of all attacked doctrines."

This opens the door for the Formula of Concord and its carefully wrought-out definitions. The entire line of "Kirchenordnungen" discloses the processes and also largely the content of the later and more compacted Lutheran doctrinal statements.

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.

Our Lord instituted two sacraments, viz., that of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, corresponding to that of Circumcision and the Passover—the one the inductive, the other the commemorative rite of the Old Testament. To these the Roman Catholic and Greek churches added five others, viz., confirmation, penance, extreme unction, ordination and matrimony. The Lutheran, with the great body of Protestant churches, has been content with the Scriptural number.

And it may not come amiss to note the fact that no church in the Protestant Christian world has been so clearly marked by its distinctive fundamental doctrines as the Lutheran. It is therefore eminently proper that we understand what we mean by a sacrament before we proceed to discuss the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments.

The Council of Trent defined a sacrament thus: "A sacrament is something presented to the sense which has the power, by divine appointment, not only of signifying but also of conveying grace." Luther says "A sacrament is an observance appointed by God, in which one makes use of a visible thing, which has the divine Word of command and promise." Another has defined a sacrament as "a divine ordinance instituted by Christ in which by means of an outward and visible sign the purchased blessings of salvation are set forth, offered and sealed to those who are truly in covenant relation with Him." Another very simple definition is, "A sacrament is a visible element conveying invisible grace."

I. A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM.

Article IX of the Augsburg Confession, according to the German text, reads as follows: "Respecting baptism it is taught, that it is necessary; that grace is offered through it; and that

children ought to be baptized, who through such baptism are presented to God and become acceptable unto Him. Therefore the Anabaptists are condemned who teach that infant baptism is improper."

According to the Latin text of the Confession the statement is as follows: "Of baptism they teach that it is necessary unto salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered, and that children are to be baptized, who by baptism, being offered to God, are received into God's favor. They condemn the Anabaptists, who allow not the baptism of children, and affirm that children are saved without baptism."

Our Lord not only instituted the sacrament of baptism but commanded its administration to be continued, as recorded in the Gospel, (Matt. 28:19) "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And according to Mark (16:15, 16) it is written: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

As baptism was instituted by Christ, the Son of God, in the name of the Trinity, in connection with a divinely wrought-out plan of salvation it must be a divine institution.

The constituent elements of Baptism are water and the Word of God. As in nature things are constituted by the combination of elements, so in the plan of salvation administered by the Church, institutions are formed by the appropriation and union of natural and supernatural elements. In the constitution of baptism the natural element is water, the supernatural is the Word of God. "For," as Luther's Larger Catechism (p. 153) declares, "If the Word is separated from the water, it is not different from that used for ordinary purposes, and it may well be styled a common ablution; but when it is connected with the Word, as God ordained it, it is a sacrament, and is called a Christian baptism." And this is in perfect accord with the declaration of the Articles of Smalcald (Book of Concord, p. 299): "Baptism is nothing else, but the Word of God connected with water, commanded through His institution," or as Paul says (Eph. 5:26), "a washing of water by the Word."

The Rev. Dr. F. W. Conrad, of sacred memory, has therefore

written (see LUTH. QUAR., Vol. IV, p. 479): "The wisdom of God is manifested in nature, by adapting certain elements for combination, and the same wisdom is exhibited by the adaptation of water and the Word to form a sacramental union. To the accomplishment of this end, it was necessary that water, which, as a natural element, was unfitted to enter into combination with the Word as a supernatural element, should be so changed by its appropriation to a religious end, as to be adapted for a union with the Word in the sphere of the supernatural. This adaptation the water receives through its consecration and use in baptism. In this manner it becomes an efficacious sign, a vehicle of truth, "a visible Word," analogous in its nature to the written Word. While the water, therefore, as a sign or symbol, reveals the depravity of man, and the necessity of regeneration, the Word enforces the command of God, and presents the promise of pardon, grace and salvation." The water and the Word thus united, applied and sanctified by the Holy Ghost become true baptism to the recipient.

Our Confession declares that through baptism the grace of God is offered. Quoting Dr. Conrad again: "By the grace of God are meant those moral and spiritual influences which God, out of pure favor, has introduced into our world, through the mediation of Jesus Christ, under whose operation man is induced to exercise faith in the Word and promises of God, through which he obtains remission of sins, becomes a new creature, and is recognized as an heir of eternal life. These gracious influences are exerted by the Holy Spirit, through the Word of God. And as we have seen that water, as a constituent element of baptism, by its appropriation to a sacramental purpose, becomes an efficacious sign, and as a "visible Word, united with a written or spoken Word, with which the Holy Spirit is united, and through which He operates, baptism becomes a means of grace co-ordinate with the Word of God. As grace is offered through the promise of the Gospel made in baptism, and when this promise is received by faith the grace of God is also conferred in baptism, and becomes efficacious in the justification, regeneration and salvation of the soul. And as children are to be baptized, grace is offered to them, as well as to adults, by baptism."

"Thus" (quoting myself from Around The Home Table, p. 76), "by baptism in the place of circumcision, children are

brought into covenant favor with God. Circumcision identified the children with the people of God. The uncircumcised child was ordered to be cut off. But by baptism they are brought into covenant favor with God, and hence become heirs of the promise, For (Acts 2:38, 39) it is written, "The promise is unto you and to your children." Let us not mistake however, baptism as regeneration itself. It is a means to that end. Paul in his letter to Titus (3:5) calls it "The washing of regeneration." Our Lord said (John 3:5), "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." But baptism is not regeneration itself—"ex opere operato"—as taught by some, but it is the means to that end." But if true baptism, properly administered, and truely received, regeneration becomes an assured fact.

While our Confession does not designate or describe the efficacy or benefits to the adult believers, the Smaller Catechism, in answer to the question (Q. 329, p. 95), "What are the benefits of baptism?" says, "Baptism works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe, as the Word and promise of God declare." And in answer to the question (Q. 332, p. 95), "How can water produce such great effects?" says, *"It is not the water, indeed, that produces these effects, but the Word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith which relies on the Word of God connected with the water. For without the Word of God, water is simply water, and not baptism."* But with the Word of God it is baptism, that is a gracious water of life, and a "washing of regeneration" in the Holy Ghost; as St. Paul says to Titus (3:5): "According to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by His grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." That is to say that baptism, thus set forth, was regarded as a means of washing away original, and sealing the pardon of actual sin, as well as a means of imparting the Holy Spirit, through whose agency the soul is born anew and sanctified by faith in the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. Not that the work is wrought "ex opere operato," but that the faith which lays hold upon the Word and promises of

God also received the Holy Ghost by whom the new creature is wrought out.

II. A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

There are three names applied to this sacrament, viz., the Eucharist, the Sacrament of the Altar, and the Lord's Supper.

Bishop Taylor observes that "a sacrament denotes an oath or vow, and that the Word has been applied with special emphasis to the Lord's Supper where the most sacred vows are renewed by the Christian in commemorating the death of His Redeemer. The term Eucharist denotes the giving of thanks,..*..*..expressing grateful remembrance of Christ's suffering and death."

For a dogmatic statement of this sacrament we quote from "The Unaltered Augsburg Confession," Art. X, which reads as follows: "Concerning the Holy Supper of the Lord it is thus taught, that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present under the form of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and there administered and received."

Luther (in the Larger Catechism, p. 164), gives us this definition or explanation of this statement of the Lord's Supper in answer to the question, "What is the Sacrament of the Altar?" "It is the true body of Christ our Lord, in and with bread and wine, commanded through the Word of Christ, for us Christians to eat and drink. And as we have said concerning Baptism, that it is not simple water, so we also say here, this sacrament is bread and wine, *but not mere bread and wine,* as taken to the table on other occasions, *but bread and wine comprehended in the Word of God, and connected with it.* It is the *Word,* I say, that makes and distinguishes this sacrament so that it is not mere bread and wine, but *is and is called, the body and blood of Christ.* For, * * when the Word is added to the external element, it becomes a sacrament."

The doctrine of the "Real Presence of Christ" in the Lord's Supper, as presented in this article of our Confession has been the chief point of controversy. And while the occasion of this controversy has been, in part at least, a war of words, there has been a vital difference of opinion in the interpretation of the words of Christ, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," and

perhaps also in part a failure to apprehend the deeper and more significant truth intended to be conveyed by our Lord in these statements.

The Rev. Dr. C. P. Krauth (Conservative Ref. p. 599) amplifies the article thus:

1. "That the true body and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects.

2. That the sacramental objects are truly present in the Lord's Supper.

3. That this true presence is under the form or species of bread and wine.

4. That present under this form or species they are communicated.

5. That thus communicated they are received by all communicants."

By the true body we mean that body in which our Savior was actually incarnate, as opposed to His mystical body, which is the Church. Eph. 1:22, 23; 5:32. Some minds have been confused also by the use of different adjectives descriptive of His body, such as "the natural body," and "the glorified" body of Christ. But in fact Christ's true body, His natural body, and His glorified body are one in identity. The only matter to be borne in mind is that the words "True" and "Natural" refer to its essence, while the word "glorified" refers to its condition. The glorification of His body neither made it cease to be true nor natural. That is, it was no more an unreal, ideal or imaginary body after its glorification than before. Hence the doctrine of the Lutheran Church that it was the true body which was given for us. For Christ, as He instituted the Lord's Supper said: "This is my body which is given for you." "Therefore," says Dr. Krauth, "the sacramental object must be His true body. For neither His mystical body, nor the Holy Spirit dwelling in His body, nor a sign or symbol of His body, could have been given for us, and that only can be the sacramental object."

By the true blood we mean that blood which was the actual life—the vitality and strength of His human body—that "precious blood" wherewith we are bought. We believe that it was His true blood which was shed for us for the remission of sins. For Christ said, "This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for the remission of sins." In these words Christ did not

say, this is the efficacy of my blood, nor the Holy Spirit uniting us with His blood. nor yet that it was a sign or symbol of His blood, but simply and plainly, "This is my blood." Hence from the plain and very simple language of Him who instituted the Sacrament of the Altar we believe in the *Real presence* of the *true body* and *blood* of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Equally simple and plain also is the language of Paul (1 Cor. 10:16): "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

We do not believe, however,

1. That this presence consists of any such essential change of the elements of bread and wine into the body, flesh, blood, soul and divinity of our Lord, as that of the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation. We do not believe that there is any conversion or transformation of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. But we believe that the bread remains bread, and the wine remains wine, entirely unchanged in their properties and accidents, that is, in everything which constitutes them what they really are. Our Lord does not say, "Take, eat, this is my transformed body," or "this is my transformed blood." But simply, *"this is my body, this is my blood."* Hence the bread in the Lord's Supper continues *real bread,* and the wine *real wine.* But both are means by which the body and blood of Christ are conveyed to us. Hence Paul in (I Cor. 10:16) speaks of the visible elements in the holy sacrament as bread and wine. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the *blood of Christ?* The bread which we break, is it not the *communion* of the *body of Christ?"* Is there even an implied change or transformation of the wood of the vine into something else in its conveyance of sap, vitality, life from the ground through itself to the branches, thence into the foilage and fruit? And so Paul, by inspiration, has written of the bread and the cup.

2. We do not mean that the presence of the body and blood of Christ consists in any local or physical inclusion in the bread and wine, or of a commingling of them into one mass, such as belong to natural bodies. *We do not believe in any physical or local presence whatever.* The bread does not coalesce with the body, and the wine with the blood, into one substance. There

is no assumption of the elements into the humanity of Christ. Theologically this doctrine is called "Impanation," or "Consubstantiation," a doctrine which the Lutheran Church has always stoutly rejected, though unjustly charged with holding it. In the institution of the Lord's Supper, Christ did not say, "Take, eat; in this bread is included my body, or in this cup is included my blood." No, He did not say that. And although with the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are communicated to us, we must not conceive the gross idea that the body and blood of Christ are locally enclosed in the elements.

3. We do not mean that in the Lord's Supper we partake of His body and blood by gross, carnal or natural eating or drinking. Evidently our Lord, when He said, "Take, eat, this is my body," * * and "this is my blood," did not wish to be understood in a natural, carnal sense, as if His disciples gathered around the table, were really to eat His living, natural body, or to drink His natural blood, then coursing through His veins. No, not that.

4. We do not believe that the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper consists in a mere figurative representation; that is, that the bread only represents, or signifies His body, and that the wine only represents, or signifies His blood. This is the other extreme and can not be accepted as scriptural from several considerations:

(1). This idea is opposed by the demands of all those types of the Old Testament which contemplate Christ as the Paschal Lamb, who is to be present in that nature in which He was slain, not after the shadowy mode of the old dispensation, but after the true mode of the new—in the New Testament Paschal. It is through His human nature that Christ is our Paschal Lamb sacrificed; and therefore it must be through His human nature that Christ our Paschal Lamb is eaten. If it was not through His divinity, separate from His humanity, that He was sacrificed upon the cross, it can not be that through His divine nature, separate from His humanity, He is given to us at His table.

(2). This idea is opposed by the demands of the type of the Old Testament sacrifices, which were not only to be offered to God, but to be partaken of by the priests and offerers. That body and blood which were offered to the Father, and by Him

accepted, must also be partaken of by those for whom they were offered, and the partaking must be a *true one,* as the offering itself was true. But in order to be a *true partaking* there must be a *true presence.*

(3). This idea is opposed by a proper translation of the original words of the institution. Our Lord did not say, this represents my body, but in the plainest and most simple language possible said, *"This is my body"* and *"This is my blood."* Nor does the Greek copulative, "eimi," by any proper translation mean to "represent," to "signify," or "is a symbol of." We base this declaration, (a) on the fact that no reputable translation, ancient or modern, has so rendered the word. No one of scholarship has ever dared to insert in the text of his translation, "this signifies," "represents" or "is a symbol of" my body. But if *eimi* means any or all of these, why have not some of our scholars—our lexicographers—given the public the benefit of their knowledge of this little word? The fact is, it simply means what it has always been translated—simply "is." (b) That no impartial dictionary of the Greek language, whether general or New Testament assigns any such meaning to the original "eimi." (c) That no standard dictionary of the English language assigns such a meaning to the English copulative "is" or "to be." But it simply means what it says. Hence the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, that the true body and blood of Christ are really present in the Lord's Supper, not in any such sense as above named, but *in a supernatural* and *incomprehensible* way. Even the late Dr. A. A. Hodge (Popular Lectures, p. 408) says, "It does not do to say that this presence is only spiritual, because that phrase is ambiguous. If it means that the presence of Christ is not something objective to us, but simply a mental apprehension or idea of Him subjectively present to our consciousness, then the phrase is false. Christ as an objective fact is as really present and active in the sacrament as are the bread and wine, or the minister, or our fellow communicants by our side."

But while we can not fully comprehend and explain how this is, can we not, in the province of faith, lay hold of the great truth, and by it, without the course of philosophical reasoning, accept our Lord's simple statement, *"This is my body"* and *"This is my blood?"* However a simple illustration from God's Word may aid in simplifying and impressing the idea in a meas-

ure at least. According to the Gospel of St. John (XV, 1-5) our Lord gave us the parable of the vine and the branches, which we will use as a practical illustration in this case. The vine planted in the ground, and communicating from it to the branches, represents Christ the only begotten of the Father, sent forth from Him. The branches in living connection with the vine represent all believers by faith engrafted into Jesus Christ, the Vine, and in living communion with Him. But now proper sustenance for the life is in the ground to be absorbed through the tiny pores of the roots and conveyed through the vine to the branches. The operation begins; the life flows; we see the buds, then the leaves, the blossoms, and the ripened fruit. Does any one question the *real presence,* in species and essence, of the vine in the branches? And can any one fully comprehend, and will he attempt a clear and simple explanation of just how it all came about? And as the vine becomes the medium of communication, are its visible parts in any wise changed into something else? In our conception of the process of the communication of life from the ground to the branches, must we think of "Transubstantiation" or of "consubstantiation?" O, no! "Folly! Folly!" would cry our natural philosophers. And yet, that which is communicated is the body—it is the very essence which composes and constitutes that body—the body of vine and branches. Precisely so with Christ in the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. We can no more fully comprehend and explain how He is communicated to us through the medium—the bread and the wine—than we can the process in the case of the vine and the branches. But does any one question the reality in the process in the vine because he can not fully comprehend and explain it all? Why then raise the question about the *"Real Presence of Christ"* in the Lord's Supper? Why not take Him at His Word when He says, "Take, eat, this is my body,"..*..*.."this is my blood." If we can not fully comprehend, why not believe? Shall we be guilty of limiting our faith to the bound of our reason? God forbid!

Boulder, Colo.

ARTICLE VII.

THE LUTHERAN USAGE OF LENT.

BY E. E. ORTLEPP, D.D.

The word *Lent* is derived from the Anglo-Saxon *lencten* which, like the German *Lenz,* signifies Spring, and in itself does not refer to the religious character of the season. The ecclesiastical meaning of Lent is expressed by the Lutheran *Passion* and the Roman Catholic *Fasts (Fastenzeit).* In the Lutheran sense, as the word indicates, Lent is that season of the Church Year which preeminently reminds the Christians of the sufferings of their divine Savior. It includes the cycle of 46 days preceding Easter, and is itself introduced by three preparatory Sundays.

The earliest traces of the Lenten season lead back to remote antiquity in the Church. The bizarre features of the Middle Ages proper may be safely passed by as unproductive of original contributions; for where an apparently new form appears, it is but an elaboration or distortion of the older, plainer, and better usage. To the Lutheran Church belongs the credit of having restored to Lent its original, inherent, and adequate conception as the season of the Passion.

I. THE ORIGIN OF LENT.

Dies stationum. These were Wednesday and Friday of each week, anciently observed as half-fast days by abstaining from food until 3 p. m., a custom probably derived from Judaism. The Pharisees fasted twice a week, namely, on Monday—because on that day Moses ascended Sinai,—and on Thursday—because he was said to have returned on that day. The Christians made a change at an early date. The Διδαχή 8, 1 (about 150 A. D.) enjoins the Gentile Christians to hold their fasts, in opposition to "hypocrites," on Wednesday and Friday: νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρᾳ σαββάτων κσι πέμπτῃ. ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν Both Irenaeus, who died between 190-200 A. D., and Tertullian (220?) mention these days, the latter stating that the fasts

were as yet *ex arbitrio, non ex imperio* (De jejun, 2). During the third century the two days were enjoined as fast days and distinguished with special church services, as seen in the Syrian Didaskalia 21, and Origen (In Lev. hom. 10.) In the fourth century the same rule was in effect (Apost. Can. 69), and Jerome (420) insists on the Lenten fast—centering in Wednesday and Friday—as an *apostolic* commandment. All this serves to show the antiquity, popularity, and stability of these two days.

Wednesday was chosen as reminding of the evil counsel and the bargain of the betrayer, while Friday commemorated the Lord's death; and whereas the ancient Church Year centered in the week, each week became a celebration of Christ's Passion, a repetition of Lent. Again, Easter was the highest Christian festival and the beginning of the Church Year, sufficient to endow the Wednesday and Friday before the feast of the Resurrection with special dignity, until the observance of two days expanded into a season covering several weeks. Excepting Easter, therefore, Lent was the first established cycle of the Church Year, with Wednesday and Friday standing forth as the pioneers.

The Quadragesima=τεσσαρακοστή=40 days. Several circumstances helped together to make the days and weeks of Lent a period of fasting. The surpassing prominence and influence of Easter in the growing Church demanded a preparation of corresponding solemnity. The general hope of Christ's second advent on Easter permeated the exercises with a spirit of serious devotion. The great joy of the Resurrection could not be conceived without contrasting it with the sorrowful time when the bridegroom of the Church was in the power of Death, days of mourning *in quibus ablatus est sponsus* (Tertul. de jejun, c. 13). Finally, the daily hardships and trials, particularly the increasing persecutions, induced the Christians to remember the more ardently the sufferings of their Lord, and they did so by adding day after day in which to express their fears or hopes through fasting and mourning. For a long time a marked diversity as to the duration of Lent prevailed. Irenaeus says that "some think they ought to fast for one day, others for two days, and others even for several, while others reckon forty hours both of day and night to their day." (Ep. ad Vict. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 5, 24). "Irenaeus then goes on to say that this variety is not merely a thing of his own time, but of much older date; an important statement,

as carrying back the existence of the fast practically up to apostolic times." (Smith, Dict. Ant. 972). Rome seems to have favored three weeks, while Greece, Egypt and Palestine had six, and Constantinople seven. Despite these wide variations the fast was generally called τεσσαρακοστή, which indicates that stress was laid on the number forty. Indeed, the Christians connected it with the period during which Jesus was in the power of death, they wrongly estimating it at forty hours, from noon on Friday to 4 a. m. on Sunday. The number of *days* was suggested by the fasts of equal duration recorded of Moses, Elias, and our Lord in the wilderness. The maximum of forty days is thought to have been definitely fixed by Gregory the Great (604).

Ancient Observance. The ante-paschal or quadragesimal fast was from the beginning, and afterwards, in the Western Church, remained, the most prominent of the five stated fasts. Forbidden on Sundays throughout the Church, the fast was very strict during Lent, lasting from morning until evening, as Ambrose (de Elia Jejun. 10) and Chrysostom (Hom. 6 et 8 in Gen.) inform us, and requiring total abstinence from food. The prevailing idea of the Lenten fast was not the general one, attaching to all similar exercises, namely, to quicken zeal and to aid devotion, but rather the definite one of preparing oneself for the approaching Easter and the coming Christ, to please and imitate the Lord: *Invenimus enim in quodam libello ab apostolis dictum, Beatus est qui etiam jejunat prae eo ut alat pauperem. Hujus jejunium valde acceptum est epud Deum et revera digne satis: imitatur enim Illum qui animam suam posuit pro fratribus suis.* (Origen, Hom. in Lev. 10). The immediate occasions to sustain the zest in fasting were, for the church members, the great Easter-communion, always considered of exceptional prominence; for the catechumens, the solemn Easter-Baptism; and for the penitents seeking readmission, the generous Easter-Absolution.

During Lent the number of services was increased and sermons were delivered daily. Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* were such Lenten sermons. The catechumens were carefully instructed (Augustine, sermo 210), for they had to present themselves at least forty days before Baptism, as the Roman bishop Siricius (399) stipulated. Of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (351-86), there are seventeen lectures extant, delivered to his

catechumens during Lent. Scripture lessons were selected and read with reference to the character of the season. In the Oriental churches Genesis was read and expounded to contrast the *Creation* of the world with the *Redemption* of the world, the beginning of the *Old* with the beginning of the *New*. Chrysostom did so in Antioch and met the same custom in Constantinople where he continued to preach on Genesis. In the Occident the books of Job and Jonah furnished lessons and texts, as Ambrose testifies; Job was the type of the suffering Savior, while Jonah caused the repentance of Nineveh and with his stay in the belly of the whale prefigured the buried and rising Lord. Nebe, Ep. I, 29 f. The account of Christ's Passion was in all churches reserved for Holy Week. The themes diligently preached and the works earnestly demanded of the hearers were castigation of the body, chastity, temperance, repentance and forgiveness. Jerome, in the preface to his *comes,* justifies his choice of lessons for Lent as being in conformity to the customs of the Church, texts treating *in capite quadragesimae de abstinentia escarum et sobrietate, de poenitentia, de pudicitia, de remissione inimicitiarum.* Nebe Ep. II, 4. Thus the Church observances bore the pronounced character of penitence, which found its sternest expression in the order of the Council of Laodicea (A. D. 365), prohibiting all things of a festal nature in Lent, confining even the celebration of festivals of the martyrs and the oblation of bread and wine in the Sacrament to Saturdays and Sundays.

As the influence of Christianity rose in the community, and especially after the Church had been recognized by the State, the world-denying spirit of the Lenten solemnities overstepped the boundaries of the congregation and asserted itself also in public life. All forms of social enjoyment were at first frowned upon and then forbidden. Public games, theatrical shows, and noisy entertainments had to cease, and where they were beyond the control of the Church, the Christians were warned against participating in them. Chrysostom, in two Lenten homilies *(Hom. VI et VII in Gen. c. 1),* preaches against the horse-races and points to the scandal caused by Christians who attend them. In a canon (52), which probably forms an exception as to strictest regulation, the Council of Laodicea forbade all celebrations of marriages and even birthday festivals in Lent. The ecclesi-

astical as well as the civil law honored the holy season. "The Council of Nicaea (325) appoints Lent as one of the two periods in the year for the sitting of a synod of the bishops of the province to revise the sentence of excommunication inflicted by any of their number in the preceding season, as a check upon undue severity." Dict. Ant. 975. A law (A. D. 380) of the Theodosian code prohibited the hearing of criminal cases during the quadragesimal days. Ambrose states that death sentences were not issued; according to him imprisoned debtors were released, at least in the week before Easter: *solebant debitorum laxari vincula. Ep. 20, 6.* The severity of penal procedure was generally relaxed, the infliction of corporeal punishment, as the torturing of robbers, being interdicted. As if the earliest dawn of Easter were, weeks in advance, discernible on the horizon and prompted the believers to let their wretched brethren share in expectant joy!

We turn now to a review of the Lenten season as it was completed about the end of the fifth century.

II. THE LENTEN SEASON.

Three Introductory Sundays. These are called Septuagesimae, Sexagesimae and Quinquagesimae, the very names making their relation to Lent obvious if we remember that the Lenten fast was called Quadragesima. When the beginning of the Church Year was transferred from Easter to an earlier date, many churches selected Septuagesimae as the ecclesiastical New Year's Day. Thereby, instead of being slighted, Easter was all the more exalted, since now even its preparatory cycle claimed longer duration and profounder importance. The circumstance that Lent looks backward and appropriates the three preceding Sundays, is due to the varied styles of counting the forty days. In some parts the Sundays only were exempt from the fastings, while frequently the Saturdays and, occasionally, even the Thursdays were also exempted, with the result that the forty fast days proper were spread over six, seven, and as many as nine weeks. As stated already, Gregory the Great (542-604) is generally thought to have established uniformity by enacting that Lent should consist of the forty-six days preceding Easter, an arrangement which, since the six Sundays are not counted as fast days, se-

cures the compact Quadragesima. Therefore, those three Sundays did not become neutral territory between Epiphany and Lent, but assumed an introductory and preparatory office to the Lenten season.

Consequently, on *Septugesimae* (κυριακη πρὸ τῆς αποκρέω) the "fasts of the clergy" began in distinction from the "fasts of the people" which commenced on Ash Wednesday. The Hallelujah in the Mass was omitted, and no weddings were performed. The catechumens assembled for the first time to receive instruction. On *Sexagesimae* (τῆς αποκρέω, *the Sunday of the carnival)* the clergy ate flesh for the last time; the so-called *Butter-week* began, when butter, cheese, milk, and eggs were permitted, a diet once more restricted on *Quinquagesimae* (τῆς τυροφάγος, *the Cheese-eater),* and again on Ash Wednesday.

Ash Wednesday. The name originated in the rite of burning palm leaves—consecrated on Palm Sunday of the previous year—and the benediction of the ashes, a ceremony which the priest was allowed to perform only in the absence of the bishop. "The priest or bishop, after blessing the ashes, sprinkled them with holy water, and they were then received from his hand by the clerics and laymen present." Dict. Ant. 977. With the ashes the sign of the cross was made on the forehead of the worshipper, as a symbol of repentance, accompanied with the warning words based on Gen. 3, 19, and Apoc. 2, 5: *Memento, homo, quia cinis es, et in cinem reverteris; age pocnitentiam, et prima opera fac.* Ash Wednesday ushered in the general and vigorous Lenten fast, wherefore it is also known as *caput jejunii:* Throughout the season "all amusements were stopped, all criminal trials rested, and the din of traffic in streets and markets as far as possible restricted." Kurtz, Ch. H. I, 356. The Gelasian Sacramentary ordained that the penitents be taken early on this day, clothed in sack-cloth, and put into seclusion until Maundy Thursday, when reconciliation took place.

Sundays in Lent. Though not observed as fast days, the six Sundays in Lent were diligently employed to impress the people with the necessity of fasting and mourning. The Old Church gospel on *Invocavit,* Matt. 4, 1-11, was chosen on account of Christ's fasting in the wilderness, and its homiletical use is thereby indicated. On *Reminiscere* the devil vexing the daughter of the woman of Canaan, Matt. 15, 21-28, illustrated the sad

bondage from which the world must be freed. On *Oculi,* also known as *dies scrutinii, dominica abrenunciationis,* or *dom. exorcismi,* the catechumens were thoroughly examined before the assembled congregation, and the devil was exorcised, all his pomp and works being renounced by the catechumens. The names of sponsors for the Easter-baptisms were handed in to the clergy on this day, or latest on the following Sunday. *Laetare* brought a note of rejoicing into the somber celebrations, for those who had renounced the devil now formally and publicly surrendered themselves to the Lord as the first fruit of his Passion, wherefor this Sunday was known as *dom. redemptionis ab idolatria.* From the Monday after Laetare to the following Sunday the week-day lessons, with but one exception, were taken from the gospel of St. John, in order to show forth the enmity of the Jews against Christ. *Judica* was originally, as seen in the Gregorian Sacramentary, the Passion Sunday, the Sunday of the Cross: *dom. passionis,* or *dom. de cruce,* but gradually that name passed over to *Palmarum.*

Palm Sunday. This day gained its distinction from the very ancient and interesting observance in Jerusalem, which commemorated the Entry of the Lord. At first the Occident seems to have paid no attention to the entry on this day, rather ordering the Passion according to St. Matthew to be read in the service, which led to shifting the name Passion Sunday from Judica to Palmarum. But Gregory Nyssen (between 394-398?) already mentions the Palm Sunday processions as part of the celebrations in the East and West, and at the end of the seventh century the carrying of palm branches was universally practiced. On this Sunday the Apostolicum was confided to the neophytes found worthy of baptism to learn it by heart during the coming week. In Gall, as Isidore of Sevilla (570?-636) states, the Sunday was called the *capitalavium,* because the catechumens had their heads washed so as not to come dirty to the baptism on Easter. This custom certainly antedates Isidore's time, since long before him bathing was forbidden during Lent, excepting on Maunday Thursday, and the mere dictates of cleanliness must have demanded something like a eapitalavium in certain cases which made the Maunday bath impracticable. Palm Sunday is also called Indulgence Day (Jerome), because the emperors released prisoners and the courts of justice remained closed dur-

ing the ensuing week. As a token of mourning at the opening of Holy Week, the Gloria Patri was silenced in the services, though, generally, Palm Sunday was a day of gladness.

Holy Week. Beginning with Palm Sunday—in the Greek Church with Monday,—Holy Week brought on the culmination of the great Lenten Preparation with Good Friday, introduced by Maunday Thursday, as the climax. The high esteem in which this week was held by the ancient Church is seen in the names. The *Constitutiones apost. 8, 33,* toward the close of the third century, call it ἡ ἑβδομὰς μεγάλη, and speak of its universal acceptance at that time. So also Chrysostom, for instance in his *Hom. 30 c. 1 in Gen. X et XI.* In the fourth century the week was universally called *hebdomas magna, septimana major.* The term *sancta* was also occasionally employed, but has almost exclusively become the property of the Protestants in their "Holy Week." In the Roman Church the official name today is *hebdomada magna* or *major.* In German the week is called *Charwoche* i. e., "week of mourning," or *Stille Woche*=quiet week. Its observance belongs to earliest antiquity and can be traced back to almost apostolic times. Besides the *Constitutions* already mentioned, and previous to them (about 260 A. D.), Dionysius of Alexandria attests its universal acceptance, while the still earlier statements of Irenaeus and Tertullian, cited in the first part of this article, refer to this week particularly. The primitive fast, at first extending over two or three days, gradually occupied the entire week, commencing with midnight on Palm Sunday, and ending at cockcrow on Easter. Throughout the week the diet was restricted to bread, salt, and vegetables, with water as a beverage. This plain fare was not to be eaten before 3 p. m. or evening, while total abstinence was enjoined on Friday and Saturday, or at least on Saturday. Special mortifications were engaged in, such as sleeping on the ground, strict continence, watchings, and xerophagy. Epiphan. Haeres 75, 3. The rich liturgical celebrations of the West rested mainly on the ancient customs in vogue at Jerusalem where the Holy Week naturally was of peculiar significance. A Spanish lady, Egeria, has recorded the services witnessed during her visit at Jerusalem (about 385 A. D.) in the *Peregrinatio Silviae, c. 30-37,* of which an interesting sketch is found in PRE³ 21, 415-422. The spirit of leniency which permeated the whole Lenten season flowed from

the sacred source of this week. The councils forbade work and laid stress on singing hymns and participation in services. The clergy instructed the people to remember the poor, and rich alms were brought; they admonished the masters to grant their slaves rest from secular work and to give them time for instruction in the Church; they implored the magistrates to guard the sanctity of the week, and upbraided or praised them as they deserved. Gregory of Nazianzum (Ep. 112) censured a judge for permitting spectacles during a feast. Ambrose eulogizes the younger Valentinian *(De Obitu Valentin. Consolatio)* for having refused a sentence of death during a holy season. Chrysostom refers directly to this week in his *Hom. in Gen. 30:* "Not we alone do honor this week, but also the emperors of our continent have distinguished it for good cause by granting vacation to all who manage municipal affairs, that they may use these days devoting them to divine service. For this reason the gates of the courts are closed that, mark well, all traffic and every kind of quarrel and of punishment may rest." Comp. Nebe Ev. II, 2. The Scriptures were not neglected. In the ordinary services the choice of lessons was casual and depended largely on the judgment of the clerics, but the daily services of the great week had their annually recurring texts at an early date. The offering of Isaac was a favorite passage. The book of Job was consecutively read in the Alexandrian Church, as Origen testifies: *In conventu ecclesiae in diebus sanctis legitur passio Iobi, in diebus.....in quibus in jejunio et abstinentia sanctam domini nostri Jesu Christivpassionem sectamur. (Hom. in Job 1).* The same custom prevailed in the Milan Church under the episcopate of Ambrose as he tells his sister Marcellina: *andistis librum Job legi, qui solemni munere est ecursus et tempore (Ep. 20 ad Marcellin).* The prophet Jonas and Genesis were also used, especially the latter; the homilies in the *Hexaemeron* were delivered in Holy Week. Particularly the account of Christ's Passion was reserved for this week. The general practice seems to have been to begin with Matthew's account on Palm Sunday ending with John's narrative on Good Friday. However, some congregations as, for instance, that of St. Augustine's, insisted on hearing the Passion read from but one gospel on one day: *Passio autem, quia uno die legitur, non solet legi nisi secundum Matthaeum. Volueramaliquando,ut per singulos annos secundum omnes evan-*

gelistas etiam passio legeretur: factum est, non audierunt homines, quod consueverant, et perturbati sunt. (Aug. sermo 232 in dieb. Pasch feria quarta Pasch.) Again somewhat different was the rule in the Church of Antioch, concerning which Chrysostom *(in princ. act. hom. 4.)* says that on Good Friday was read τὰ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάντα, and on Saturday, ὅτι παρεδόθη ἡμῶν ὁ κύριος, ὅτι ἐσταυρώθη, ὅτι ἀπέθανε τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὅτι ἐτάρη·

Maundy Thursday. As the entire week, so also this day had its original observance in Jerusalem from where it found its way into the Western churches. The name is undoubtedly a corruption of *dies mandatum,* derived from the antiphon *Mandatum novum do vobis, ut diligatis invicem, John 13, 34.* Others, however, derive it from the *maunds or baskets* in which gifts of charity were brought and freely distributed among the poor on that day. The ancient appellation *dies viridium* seems to have originated from the custom of eating green bitter herbs on the Passover, which would also explain the German *Gruen Donnerstag;* to this day something green is found on the dinner table of German Lutherans on Maundy Thursday. While the ordinary Thursdays in Lent had no public worship, Maundy Thursday had rich services and diversified exercises. It was the only day in the year when the Lord's Supper was celebrated without previous fasting. If at some early period the agape was ever connected with the Sacrament of the Altar, then later Maundy Thursday was the only day of the year that the practice took place in commemoration of the Institution. The Council of Carthage (A. D. 397) forbade fasting on this day: *Ut sacramenta altaris nonnisi a jejunis hominibus celebrentur excepto uno die anniversario quo coena Domini celebratur;* however, this order was revoked by the Council of Constantinople (691) on the ground that the preceding agape was not conducive to an appropriate celebration of the Lord's Supper. The main feature of the day was the commemoration of the institution of the Lord's Supper, wherefor this Thursday was generally known as the *Coena Domini.* The celebration was held in the morning, in some places also in the evening, as in the African Church, in others, three masses were customary. The Trullan Council (692) revised the order of the previous year and, on account of serious abuses, prohibited the evening celebrations altogether. The rite of washing the feet before communion encountered a

changeable fate. Augustine in his Ep. ad Januarium attests its practice on Maundy Thursday. It was generally observed in Milan, Gaul and Spain, and yet as early as A. D. 306 forbidden by the Council of Elvira while, on the contrary, the Council of Toledo (694) excluded from communion all who refused to wash their feet or to have them washed on this day. Augustine, in his Ep. ad Januarium, speaks of catechumens bathing the whole body for the sake of cleanliness anent the approaching baptism: *quia baptizandorum corpora per observationem quadragesimae sordidata cum offensione sensus ad fontem tractarentur, nisi aliquo die lavarentur. (Ep. 118-119 c. 18.)* In a number of churches the candidates for Baptism were required to recite the Creed which had been entrusted to them on Palm Sunday. The solemn absolution of the penitents took place: *Erat dies quo Dominus sese pro nobis tradidit, quo in ecclesia poenitentialia relaxantur (Ambrose, ep. ad Marcellin.)* His probation being ended, the penitent sought public readmission by casting himself down before the congregation; the psalm *Miserere* was sung, and prayers were said over the prostrate penitent, whereupon he partook of the holy Sacrament. In the fifth century the chrism, needed in large quantities for the baptisms, was consecrated, as also the oil for anointing the sick. Other features were expressive of mourning, as the silencing of the bells from midnight on Wednesday until the matins on Easter, or the stripping of the altar and the extinguishing of the lights after the vesper. At 3 p. m a candle was lit without the church and carried in procession through the congregation into the sacristy, where from the candle a lamp was kindled to be left burning until Saturday morn. The solemnity of the day affected also the non-Christian element. At first the Christians were forbidden to associate with the Jews; after the Church was in power, the Jews were prohibited to appear in public or to mingle with Christians from Maunday Thursday until Easter Monday. As a matter of mere curiosity, mainly of benefit to such as believe in an enlightened pope, let it be added that the *Constitutio Apostolicae sedis* of Oct. 12, 1869, which pretended to abolish the infamous *Bulla in coena domini,* is practically a repetition of that bull which, on every Maunday Thursday, condemned all heretics among whom Luther and his adherents are mentioned with emphasis! PRE[3], 3, 536.

Good Friday.—Originally there was no separate observance of this day, for the Crucifixion and the Resurrection were celebrated together on and as *The Great Pascha*: Easter. Soon, however, the term *Die Pascha* was applied to Good Friday, as we learn from Tertullian who speaks of the fast *die Paschae,* our Good Friday, as *communis et quasi publica jejunii religio. (de Orat. 18.)* After the time of Leo I (390?-461) the two events were separated, Friday being the πάσχα σταυρώσιμον in distinction from the πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον. "The day was observed as a strict fast, *(Syr. Didask., 21. Apost. Const. 13),* continued by those who could endure it beyond midnight of the following day. ....The kiss of peace was prohibited. (Where it had not been done already on Maundy Thursday), the altar was stript of its ornaments, and even of its coverings. The lamps and candles were gradually extinguished during matins. A long series of intercessory collects was used. A cross was erected in front of the altar, blessed, and adored. There was no celebration of the Lord's Supper, but the reserved eucharist of the previous day was partaken of by the faithful." Dict. Ant. 738. The host of the so-called *missa praesanctificatorum* was *not* "partaken of by the faithful." The priest with the entire clergy in procession brought the host on Good Friday from the side altar to the main altar where a shortened and modified liturgy was held. The host, broken into three parts of which one was cast into the chalice, was eaten by the priest alone. Drews, in PRE³ 21, 425. At the services the account of the Passion was read; in Jerusalem, from the gospel of St. John *(Pereg. Silv. c. 36.),* in the other Eastern Churches, from the four gospels, and in the West, from Matthew. In the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries there were numerous churches in which no communion was held on Good Friday, and in the first half of the seventh century the custom prevailed in Spain to omit services altogether, keeping the doors of the churches locked as a token of profound mourning. The Council of Toledo (A. D. 633), protested against that habit and ordered that, at least, sermons on the death of Christ be delivered.—The liturgical name among the Latin Christians is *Parasceve*=Preparation; among the Greeks, ἡ μεγάλη παρασκευή The Greek designation "holy Friday" is preserved in the French *vendredi saint* and in the Italian *venerdi santo.* In German the popular name is *Karfreitag*=the sad Friday. The expression

guter Freitag, the same as the English "Good Friday" is still used in some parts of Germany and was quite frequent in the sixteenth century; it is found in the Brandenburg Order of 1540.

Saturday, the Great Sabbath, τὸ μέγα σάββατον, *Sabbatum magnum,* which in the Greek Church is considered of greater dignity than even Good Friday. It bore a two-fold character: the penitential, as the conclusion of Lent; and the jubilant, as the prelude of the Resurrection. The day was kept as a strict fast both East and West, the only Saturday of the year so distinguished. The fast lasted frequently until cock-crow on Easter morn, but the rule was to break it on mid-night for, as Jerome and Lactantius reason, as Israel was delivered at mid-night, so the return of the triumphant Lord may be expected at the same hour. The main feature was the great vigil, celebrated in a solemn manner, and at an early date. Tertullian mentions it *(ad ux. II).* It was considered an apostolic order. The Syrian Didaskalia give a good account of the vigil. The people met at 3 p. m. The service consisted of prayer and supplication, of intercession especially for the Jews. Numerous Scripture lessons followed. Where the reading of the Passion had begun on Friday, as in Antioch, it was finished in this service. As the night progressed the signs of mourning were laid aside and the expectant looking for the Lord increased. The agape with the eucharist followed. In the main, the same observance remains in the fourth and fifth centuries. It was the most solemn vigil of the year called by St. Augustine *mater omnium sanctorum vigilarum (Serm. 219).* It was the night of numerous baptisms. On the Easter eve following Chrysostom's deposition 3000 catechumens were scattered by the soldiery of Constantinople, as they awaited the administration of the sacrament. Despite all watchfulness of the deacons scandalous incidents seem to have been unavoidable in that night, and with the sixth and seventh century vigils were confined to the afternoon. While at the height of its glory, about the fourth century, the night of the vigil was resplendent with many lamps and candles. Eusebius *(de Vit. Const. 4, 22)* records that Constantine suspended lamps and set up huge waxen tapers as big as columns throughout the city. Gregory Nazianzen *(Orat. de Pasch. 42)* relates how magistrates and high-born ladies carried lamps, and set up tapers at home or in churches. From this originated about A. D. 417, the solemn blessing of the

paschal taper which was lighted from newly struck and blessed fire, carried in procession before the catechumens, placed before the altar, and left burning until after the mass on Easter.

III. LENT IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

No Roman ritualism, no modern innovation: Such is the striking impression which our short review, stopping at the dark portals of the Middle Ages, gives us of Lent. In our observance of that season we betray not the faintest inclination to imitate papal ceremonies and superstitions, but rather join hands, if not with the apostles themselves, then with their immediate pupils and successors. We feel the warmly beating pulse of our brethren in Jerusalem, in Antioch, in Carthage, in Constantinople, in Rome, in the entire ancient Church at the best period of fiery trials and dearly bought victories. The history of Lent is written with the heart-blood of our forefathers. Lent was not artificially made, but grew spontaneously out of ardent love to Christ, out of sincere worship, out of the sad and glad experiences of the ancient Christians. It is an integral part of the organism, the work, and the hope of the Church. All the more sublime, then, to see the light of the Lutheran Reformation shine backward into the earliest centuries and restore to us in full beauty that which no fasts or penances, no local or individual traits could suppress, that of which mediaeval papism had completely deprived the world: The Suffering Savior and His Cross. To have helped these cardinal truths to supreme rule during Lent, remains the merit of Lutheran influence.

Luther's Position. That his attitude toward Lent was at first indifferent, if not hostile, is scarcely surprising. It is readily explained through the deplorable conditions that met him all around, and which animated him with a three-fold objection. In the first place, the *mediaeval rites* of the Roman Church appeared to him absurd. Lenten sermons had been in vogue in Germany since early in the fifteenth century. Frequently series of such Fast-sermons—*Fastenpredigten*—were preached on subects like the Prodigal Son, Noah's Ark, etc. The ancient epistles and gospels were rarely expounded, and then only in that emblematic style later so notorious. *(Zoeckler, Handbuch, III, 296).* Somewhat different were the so-called "Passion sermons," generally of an epic character, relating the sufferings of Christ, il-

lustrated with detailed and ridiculous anecdotes and explanations. This particular style emanated from the Passion-plays which were then performed throughout Europe. During the delivery of that class of sermons a cross was erected, a custom introduced by the peddlers of indulgences (Tetzel's Journeys!). What our Reformers thought of such practices is seen in Art. XV of the Apology, where they say: "In many countries, as in Italy and Spain, our adversaries have no preaching throughout the year excepting in Lent.....And even when they preach in Lent, they teach nothing but human ordinances, speaking of calling on the saints, of blessed water, and similar foolishness." Secondly, the *spiritual harm* done to the people through the Roman fasts was keenly felt by Luther. Because he himself taught and practiced the voluntary, scriptural fasting, his indictment of the Roman abuse is the more forceful. In the Church Postil he comments on the gospel of Invocavit, Matt. 4, 1-11: "This gospel is read today at the beginning of Lent that the example of Christ be pictured to the Christians and the fasts may be kept, which is nothing but apish buffonery." *(lauter Affenspiel).* In the Hauspostille, preaching on the gospel of Reminiscere, Matt. 15, 21-28: "This is a grand gospel, but they have appointed it for this Sunday, like others, because in it we read of driving out a devil. They want to indicate thereby that one ought to become pious and go to confession. But it is a bad and popish piety which can be stored up for the whole year and consists in miserable fasting and unwilling confession, of which there is no commandment." Now the scandalous system of indulgences was closely connected with the fasts, and the evils resulting therefrom had driven him into the Reformation: Is it surprising that he looked upon Lent without kindly interest? Luther's third objection touched *the social and economic* welfare of the people. The immense number of holidays imposed on the nation by the mediaeval Church, and on which no secular work was permitted, entailed a vast loss to the working classes and caused much unnecessary expense for feasting and carousing. Luther's aim was to abolish all superfluous holidays. In his sermon on Good Works, dedicated to Duke John of Saxony, on March 29, 1520, he says: "Would to God, that christendom had no holiday excepting Sunday, that the feast 'Of Our Lady' and 'All Saints' were all transferred to Sunday; then

many bad habits *(Untugend)* would be avoided, and through the work of the week-days the countries would not be so impoverished. But now we are burdened with many feasts to the detriment of souls, body, and possessions." In his pamphlet addressed to the German nobility, he pleads for the abolition of holidays giving as a cause the "bad habits" consisting in drunkenness, gambling, idling, and all manners of sin with which the feasts were abused. So opposed was he to the malpractice involved that in the *formula missae* of 1523, although wishing for daily services, he did not mention any observance of Lent, nor even of the Holy Week or Good Friday. But this man with the keen judgment and open mind for all that was genuine, valuable, and lasting, in the Christian Church, soon began to show interest in Lent and with his example pointed to the right celebration of Lent as we find it in our Church.

Reformatory Influence. The Reformation abolished at once the endless ceremonies of the Roman Lent; which did not hinder Luther to recognize the importance of the genuine Lenten idea which he discovered first in the Holy Week. The daily services held throughout the year were not omitted in the week before Easter and it was but natural that in its services the Passion of the Lord claimed attention. Luther, therefore, retained the—voluntary—fast of Palm Sunday and Holy Week, he learned to observe Good Friday as a holy day, and to distinguish also Maundy Thursday with sermons. He called Holy Week the *Marterwoche, Charwoche, Palm week.* In 1521 and 22 Luther preached on Maunday Thursday on the worthy reception of the Lord's Supper, and on Good Friday on the Passion in general. The mode of observing Holy Week in Wittenberg about 1526 is seen in Luther's "German Mass." The *Marterwoche*—"Week of Suffering—shall be like any other week except that the Passion be preached, one hour a day, throughout the week, or as many days as one chooses, and that those who will may take the Sacrament." If there are communicants, the Sacrament shall be administered, but secular work is not forbidden; this was recommended to the entire Arch Duchy of Saxony, but the preaching on the Passion was not made compulsory. (The Wittenberg Order of 1533). This same document prescribes two sermons each on "Good Wednesday," Maunday Thursday, Good Friday, and Saturday. If we bear in mind that Luther objected only to

superfluous holidays, and that he never counted Good Friday or Maunday Thursday as such; that he himself distinguished these two days; and that since 1528 he was in favor of retaining the more important feast days, as Christmas, Circumcision, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and several others with Biblical foundation; then we realize that the Lutheran Church of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries acted in his spirit when choosing Holy Week and the whole Lenten season for increased but voluntary services in which the Passion of Christ was paramount, leaving details to local requirement.

Thus the Brandenburg Orders of 1540 and 1572 retained the procession on Palm Sunday. On the following days the Passion according to the four gospels was read. Where foot-washing had been customary in pre-reformatory time, it was practiced on Maunday Thursday followed with a sermon on the Lord's Supper in the evening. On Good Friday the Passion season was concluded with the celebration of the Sacrament of the altar. Of peculiar nature were the Lenten examinations generally introduced in the second half of the sixteenth century, held in order to hear what the servants and children knew of the Passion. In 1580 the Sundays in Lent were used for that purpose throughout Saxony. During the Thirty Years' War they fell into oblivion, but were revived by the pietists. Spener particularly attracted old and young, rich and poor, to his catechizations held in Dresden. In Sweden such examinations are frequent to this day, where they follow the Lenten sermon and have as topics the Passion of Christ or doctrines like Redemption, Atonement, etc. The examinations last from thirty to forty-five minutes, the minister asking the whole congregation, and whoever will or can does answer him.

Lent at the present day. The aim of the Reformation to bring Christ crucified before the people during Lent, has been well accomplished in the Lutheran Church. Throughout the Lenten season week-day services are held in Lutheran countries, with special meditations, anthems, and liturgies to glorify the cross of Christ, and these services are always well attended in the Old Country, in many regions even better than the regular Sunday services. Everywhere in Lutheran countries Good Friday bears the character of a day of repentance, and is a civil holiday on which no work is done. Maundy Thursday is generally ob-

served as a half-holiday, with communion in the morning or evening. In some parts of Germany Holy Week is closed to marriages, while in strictly Lutheran regions the whole Lent is a *tempus clausum,* music, shows, dancing, public amusements, and weddings are not allowed. Among the Lutherans of America the Lenten idea has also found favor, is advocated in its classic purity and carried out in a practical manner. The *Lutheran Cyclopedia* under "Lent" says, p. 275: "Beginning with Ash Wednesday special services are held on Wednesdays, sometimes also on Fridays, at which the Passion history is read and explained and the liturgical services emphasize the work and sufferings of Christ. The general themes at these services are the doctrine of true repentance and the story of Christ's Passion. But Sundays retain their festival character and present Christ in His victorious power. Fasting is commended by some, but belongs entirely to the realm of evangelical freedom. In some city churches services are held every day in Lent." On the same subject, p. 110: "It is contrary to the genius of the gospel to lay down strict rules for the observance of this season. It is enough that the Church should make use of increased opportunity for instruction, that we should abstain from distractions, that we should exercise ourselves in self-denial both for our own sakes and the edification of others, and that all diligence should be given to prepare the catchumens for confirmation and all for the Easter communion. To this end the constant subject of meditation is the voluntary humiliation of our Savior." The Common Service recognizes the season by silencing the Hallelujah in the Sunday liturgy, while in some of our German churches the Gloria Patri also ceases, for which as a substitute the Agnus Dei is taken in one form or another. Where the liturgical colors adorn altar and pulpit, *violet* or *purple* or *black* reminds the worshipper at once of the solemnity of season and service. It may be said that the Church Year knows of no better time to sow the seed of the Word into the hearts, than Lent with its ardent, scriptural, impressive services in which song, prayer, lesson, and sermon center in the Cross of Christ; any revival is flat and stale in comparison with such Lutheran service.

To summarize: The Lutheran Lent is that season of the Church Year which in its purity originated and gradually developed among the earliest Christians, pre-eminently as a com-

memoration of Christ's Passion and preparation for Easter. In the course of centuries its genuine character was lost in numberless fasts, ceremonies, commandments, and superstitions of Roman Catholicism. The Lutheran Reformation has restored its true significance by again putting the Cross into the foreground, and has thereby carried out the intentions and fulfilled the hopes of our forefathers in Jerusalem, Antioch, and other ancient churches. In its plain yet comprehensive form the Lutheran Lent preaches Christ Crucified in a fulness and completeness which cannot be surpassed even on Christmas, Easter, or Pentecost, for all the great truths of the three highest festivals are inseparably interwoven in the sufferings of our Lord, and combine to make them what otherwise they could not be: The Passion of the Son of God, world-wide in import and eternal in result.

IV. PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS.

Introducing Lenten Services. Supposing a minister, realizing the profound value of the Lenten season, wishes to introduce appropriate services: How is he to go at it; how are the services to be conducted; what texts or subjects should be chosen; and what must be the specific purpose of each Lenten sermon?

Even where the people are decidedly opposed to so-called ritualism, the Lenten service quickly wins their favor when the truly Christian nature and antiquity of Lent is explained together with its living, practical Lutheran influence and aim. No legitimate objections remain. All other means failing, the minister can hold such services without further notice by preaching Christ's Passion on the six Sunday evenings before Easter. This is scarcely liturgically correct, but the divine Word takes precedence to the finest form developed by the Church, and it is a commendable beginning. Having heard six sermons, the people will gladly come one hour on Good Friday morning or evening, to hear the seventh on that vast subject. Within a few years the people are perfectly willing to attend such service on a week-day. Where a prayer meeting is customary on Wednesday, it can be easily expanded into a service, or where choir-practice is held on Friday, the members will readily grant that evening and choose another hour for practice. Either Wednesday or Friday of the six weeks was and is the favorite time among the ancient Christians as among the Lutherans. This system has certainly some

advantages over the custom of holding all the services in the one Holy Week. These seven consecutive services are apt to convey the—frequently unjustified—impression of un-Lutheran revivalism; they occupy the minister's time unduly in a week when he needs every minute to prepare himself for the arduous duties of Easter; and they crowd into an inadequately short space so comprehensive a theme as Christ's Passion, with the result that either no thorough teaching is maintained, or, where that is given, the hearers have no time to digest and assimilate the rich food. Lenten services appeal much more profitably to the congregation when distributed over six weeks. Then the minister in his Sunday sermons, in Sunday School, in the confirmation class, in the Luther League, in the homes, especially when visiting the sick and aged, can point to the weekly Lenten service, can recall certain truths and draw special lessons from them, and thus bring before his people again and again the Lamb of God taking away our sins. Making the Atonement an ever present, living fact with the people, inducing them to think of it for weeks, bringing it down into their daily life, that is one of the attractive features of the long Lutheran Lenten season. Someone has acutely observed that the vitality of a church may be tested by the popularity of its week-day services. If that is true, then let us not hesitate a moment to introduce Lenten services on week-days, and our solid Lutherans will be found not only attending but truly loving them, humming or singing the Lenten hymns at home, turning to the Bible record of the Passion, looking interestedly forward to the next service. The Cross of Christ has not lost its power.

The service itself may assume one of three characters: 1. The plain homilitical; 2. the liturgical-homilitical; 3. the purely liturgical, which we mention simply for the sake of completeness and therefore dispose of it in the first place.

The Purely Liturgical Service. This is a strictly Lutheran product of comparatively recent origin, and must not be confounded with the musical performances occasionally offered in some churches as a sort of attraction. The elaborate scheme has three well defined parts. First, in the opening liturgy between the minister and the whole congregation with the Introitus, the antiphones, lessons, collects, responses and chorals, the people are prepared for and led up to the prevailing theme of the service.

In the second part the main theme is unfolded in responsive singing between choir and congregation, between men and women, and children's choir, in solo, duet, etc., using prophesies, psalms, chants and recitatives in rich variety, somewhat on the order of an oratorio. Here the difficult music of the Introitus as also selections from the classics like Bach, Graun and other masters find their place. The third and concluding part consists again of liturgical responses between minister and congregation, emphasizing one great truth to be taken along into the world. The sermon is completely eliminated or a very short exhortation precedes the closing liturgy. While a service of that kind is undoubtedly edifying, it is impracticable under ordinary conditions, not only because it demands a highly efficient choir and a congregation quite at home in liturgical forms, but especially because the direct instructive preaching of the Word is missing.

There is a plainer form of liturgical service well within the capacity of the average church that fosters congregational singing. The plan is to divide the Harmony of the Passion into seven sections, one for each service. The section assigned for the evening is again divided into not less than four nor more than seven parts. After a short liturgical introduction a part of the Passion is read, followed with singing by the congregation, or by the choir, or by both, and so on until all the parts apportioned to the evening are read. A short liturgy concludes the service. No sermon is preached. When entered into in the right spirit, these services leave a profound impression and prove that the story of Christ's Passion is overwhelming even without a single word of explanation. Yet such liturgies can never be a regular substitute for the genuine Lenten service, because they fail in the substantial breaking of the bread of life. The simpler forms are by far the more lasting and effective.

The Plain Homiletical Service. It consists of hymns, Scripture lesson, sermon, and prayer.

The *hymns* must invariably and directly refer to the Passion. Unfortunately, our English hymnology is as yet rather meager in true Lenten hymns. Even when counting a few private publications, the mass of Lutheran Lenten song is but partly translated and still less available for general use. Nevertheless, even if one confines himself to the Book of Worship, enough hymns

are found that are not entirely lacking in Lenten devotion, and it is not wrong to repeat one or the other hymn in the series of services.

The *Scripture lessons* must be taken from the account of the Passion; if possible, in consecutive reading from a good Harmony. Most of the German hymnbooks have a Harmony appended, which is gratefully used by the people at home and in the service. In recent years several practical works of that nature were published in the English language, and ministers once accustomed to them will not dispense with their assistance. It is not advisable to ignore the account of the Passion even when Old Testament prophesies referring to the Passion, or some apostolic sayings based on the atoning work of Christ, are selected; or, at least, it becomes then imperative to take the text for the sermon from the Passion proper, as otherwise the idea of the Lenten service suffers violence.

The *Lenten sermon* has naturally but the one object of showing the Lamb of God to a sinful world, Christ for us rather more than Christ in us. This can best be accomplished by going directly to the source, to the record of the Passion where texts, thoughts, sermons, wait in bewildering abundance. A commendable plan, which permits no important detail to go unnoticed, is the preaching on the events in their chronological order. To do this, an *exact* Harmony is much more indispensible than in the lessons. Frequently a single word, or circumstance, or scene, if read in one of the four gospels and compared with a supposed parallel passage, or if placed in the wrong position in a faulty Harmony, seems discouragingly dark, disconnected, or contradictory while, when given its legitimate place, it throws a flood of light upon the whole account. A helpful series of sermons can also be preached from the prophesies or the apostolic sayings touching the Passion; but then it is always best to adduce and explain the corresponding passage of the gospel narrative. Prophecy and fulfilment, apostolic doctrine and the underlying fact must form an inseparable union.

The *prayers* in these services ought to be short, but never failing to thank God for the accomplished Atonement, to pray for a deeper understanding of the Passion, to ask for the fruit of Christ's blood, and to utter such petitions as may be occasioned by the particular service and sermon of the evening.

Thus the plainest service, which is nothing but what the Germans call *Bibelstunde,* can be made so impressive and attractive that the people would be disappointed if the following year they were to have none.

The Liturgic-Homiletical Service. All that has been said concerning hymn, lesson, sermon, and prayer, applies also to this form of service which gains a special solemnity and charm through an appropriate liturgy. The Lutheran Church, through her innate love for all things harmonious, inspiring, and truly worshipful in her devotions, disdains every extreme also in liturgical matters, and therefore employs her treasures for the enhancement of the Lenten service. In many quarters of our Church special liturgies for the season are much favored, and they are sufficiently simple as not to make a well-trained choir an absolute necessity. These liturgies differ considerably according to individual taste or local requirement. If one declines the aid of such material, the evening service of the Book of Worship meets the want, especially if the Lenten idea is made more prominent by adding a *Kyrie* and an *Agnus Die* in some form. Nor should the Apostles' Creed be omitted, in which the second article, spoken as it were at the Cross, is of striking vividness: "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried." No liturgy dare be of such length as to curtail the sermon which in Lutheran worship retains its prominent place.

V. SERMONS FOR TWENTY YEARS.

It may be asked whether there is not a danger of monotony threatening the preacher as well as hearer, if the texts are chosen each and every year from the gospel narrative of the Passion, and whether the subject is not exhausted in a few series of sermons. Such is not the case, as the writer can testify from experience, for he starts upon the nineteenth year preaching on the Passion before the same congregation, for fifteen years *at least* twice a week—German and English,—and discovers at every turn so much that remained to be said that, after fininshing the present third course of the entire Passion, he can do nothing better than to begin immediately with the fourth.

Let here a plan be subjoined showing how the minister can preach *twenty years* on Christ's Passion, seven sermons each

year, not once repeating the same thought if he will not observe that pastoral wisdom which advises the frequent reiteration of certain truths.

Eight Years on Christ's Passion Alone. The Harmonies are of various length. Some begin with Christ's announcement of His death; if this shorter one is used, the following scheme is slightly altered in the first and second years only. Others go back to the anointing in Bethany, and with this as the basis we gain this very rich program:

I. Year: A General Survey.

1. Evening: Jesus is anointed. The errand of John and Peter.
2. Evening: The Celebration in the Upper Room.
3. Evening: Gethsemane.
4. Evening: Jesus Before the Priests.
5. Evening: Jesus Before Pilate and Herod.
6. Evening: The Crucifixion and Death.
7. Evening: The Burial.

The preacher must be very concise to cover each part in one evening and to give the hearer a clear understanding of the main scenes together with appropriate practical application. When the season is ended both he and his people will be anxious to enter into details of the wondrous story. Those seven divisions are now made the general themes for seven years, as follows:

II. Year: The Anointing. John and Peter's Errand.

1. Evening: Mary's deed. The disciples murmur.
2. Evening: Jesus defends Mary.
3. Evening: The Entry. The fear of the Pharisees.
4. Evening: Jesus announces His death.
5. Evening: The Meeting of the Council.
6. Evening: The Bargain with the Betrayer.
7. Evening: The Errand of John and Peter.

III. Year. In the Upper Room.

1. Evening: The Strife among the Disciples.
2. Evening. The Foot-Washing.
3. Evening: The New Commandment.
4. Evening: The Betrayer Excluded.
5. Evening: The Lord's Supper.
6. Evening: A Farewell Sermon.
7. Evening: Buying a Sword.

IV. Year: Going to Gethsemane, the Agony, the Arrest.

1. Evening: On the Way to the Garden.
2. Evening: In the Garden.
3. Evening: The Agony.
4. Evening: The Sleeping Disciples.
5. Evening: The Kiss of the Betrayer.
6. Evening: Peter's Sword.
7. Evening: Jesus Led Away. The Disciples Flee.

V. Year: Jesus Before the Priests.

1. Evening: Before Annas.
2. Peter's First Denial.
3. Evening: The Court of Caiaphas.
4. Evening: Two False Witnesses.
5. Evening: Oath and Death Sentence.
6. Evening: Peter's Second and Third Denial.
7. Evening: Jesus Mocked. The Morning Session.

VI. Year: Before Pilate and Herod.

1. Evening: The End of Judas.
2. Evening: Accusations. Pilate's Question.
3. Evening: Before Herod.
4. Evening: Jesus and Barabbas.
5. Evening: Jesus Scourged.
6. Evening: Behold the Man.
7. Evening: Sentenced to the Cross.

VII. Year: On Calvary.

1. Evening: Simon of Cyrene.
2. Evening: The Wailing Women.
3. Evening: The Superscription.
4. Evening: The Parted Garments.
5. Evening: Mockeries all Arounnd.
6. Evening: Friends Near the Cross.
7. Evening: Noonday Darkness and Death.

VIII. Year: The Burial.

1. Evening: Signs at His Death.
2. Evening: The Centurion.
3. Evening: The Mourners.
4. Evening: The Breaking of Bones.
5. Evening: Joseph and Nicodemus.
6. Evening: The Funeral Procession.
7. Evening: The Seal and the Watch.

Even a hasty perusal, and infinitely more an exact study of the text, reveals the fact that the smallest portion assigned to one service furnishes so much to discuss, to explain, and to apply, that it is almost impossible to use it all in one sermon. At every step we are led into the depths of the Bible, into divers conditions of human life, into the recesses of man's heart, into the mysteries of eternity. There is nothing more sensational, more fascinating, more practical, than a study of Christ's Passion.

Now here we have a program for eight years. In eight years children have grown to be young men and women, other children taking their places. The young people of eight years ago have now perhaps established their own home. The minister himself has grown in this time, his experience is wider, his knowledge profounder, his judgment keener, and he looks with clearer eye into his Bible and into the hearts of men. If he now looks at the old manuscript of his first Lenten sermon, he smiles sadly if he ever had the conceit to believe that eight years ago he spoke out all the truth, the most interesting, the most needful truth slumbering in his text! With new hearers and new needs about him and with new conceptions in heart and mind, why should he not go through the whole series once more? The chances are that, apart from such considerations, in these eight years the dear old, noble account of the Passion has so thoroughly warmed and won his heart that he could not turn from it next Lent, even if he tried.

Yet if the unexpected happens and for any reason whatever a different style of Lenten sermons is desired, does that necessarily imply a setting aside of the Passion? By no means. Unusual possibilities offer themselves in the simultaneous treatment of prophesies and their fulfilment in Christ's Passion.

Six Years on Prophecy and its Fulfilment in Christ's Passion. There is no reason why not eight or nine years should be provided with such sermons, the Old Testament opens a wide field. Certainly, no sermon on the Passion can be preached without reference to the prophets; but it is an entirely different task to study the prophesies in detail, to follow their fate through the intervening centuries, and to meet them fulfilled in the details of the Passion. The sinful paths of a wayward nation are distinctly traced, leading to the inevitable point of rejecting Christ; the hand of God is plainly seen controlling and directing the

affairs of men until they center and are sanctified, regenerated, or simply utilized in the Cross of Calvary. A spirit of accentuated awe attaches to such sermons. It will be noticed that our plan of six years is merely a suggestion and can be readily improved, modified, restricted or expanded in texts or subjects.

FIRST YEAR.

Prophecy: *Fulfilment:*

1. Love and its Blessings.....Mary Anointing Jesus
   Song of Sol. 1, 2-4. Gen. 12,2-3.
   Lev. 16, 12-13. I Chron. 17, 27.
2. I delight to do Thy will.....Jesus announces His Death.
   Ps. 40, 6-8.
3. Going to the Sanctuary.....Jesus enters Jerusalem, etc.
   Ezek. 44, 27. II. Sam. 7, 12-13. Ps. 24, 7-10.
4. Whispering together.....The meeting of the Rulers.
   Ps. 41, 7-8.
5. The false friend.....The bargain with Judas.
   Ps. 41, 9; 55, 12-14.
6. Institution of the Passover.....In the Upper Room.
   Exod. 12.
7. The Old Covenant.....The New Commandment.
   Exod. 3:20. II Kings 23, 21-22.
   II. Chron. 35, 1-19; Jerem. 31, 31-34.

SECOND YEAR.

1. The Blood of Beasts.....The Lord's Supper.
   Exod. 24, 6-8; 29, 10-12; 36; 30, 10.
2. The Scattered Sheep....."All Ye Shall be Offended."
   Zech. 13, 7.
3. Hours of Grief.....The Agony.
   Ps. 91, 11-15; Isai. 54, 7-14; 63, 8-9.
4. They Gather Themselves Together..Jesus Taken Captive.
   Ps. 35, 7; 15-16.
5. Unfaithful Priests.....Before Annas and Caiaphas.
   I. Sam. 2, 10, 35.
6. Visions of the Future.....The Son of Man in the
   Dan. 7, 13-14; Deut. 18, 18-19. Clouds of Heaven
   Deut. 32, 41-43.

7. Help for the Needy.....Peter's Repentance.
Ps. 72, 12-14.

THIRD YEAR.

1. False Witnesses.....False Witnesses.
Ps. 27, 12; 35, 11-12; 19.
2. The Bloody Sacrifice.....Sentenced by the Priests.
Numb. 19, 2-4; Ps. 118, 22-23.
3. Potters' Field.....The End of Judas.
Zech. 11, 12-13.
4. Be wise, Ye Judges.....Before Pilate.
Ps. 2, 10; 24, 10; 52, 7; 112, 4-7.
5. Without a Blemish.....Testimonials of Innocence.
Lev. 21, 21-23; Jerem. 23, 6.
6. The Kings rise up.....Before Herod.
Ps. 2, 2.
7. His Stripes.....Jesus Scourged.
Isai. 50, 6; 52, 13-15; 53, 5-6.

FOURTH YEAR.

1. The King.....The Crown of Thorns, Behold Your King.
Ps. 72.
2. The Sign of Blood.....His Blood Be Upon Us.
Exod. 12, 13.
3. A Man of Sorrows.....Behold the Man.
Isai. 53, 3-4.
4. Our Iniquities.....He Bore His Cross.
Isai. 53, 4-7.
5. Among Transgressors.....Two Malefactors Led Forth.
Isai. 53, 12; Lev. 4, 20-21.
6. The Day of Terror.....The Wailing Women.
Isai. 2, 19-21; 13, 6-14.
7. Sin and Atonement.....The Crucifixion.
Gen. 3, 15; Lev. 16, 29-34;
Deut. 12, 13-14; Ps. 89, 45.

FIFTH YEAR.

1. Giving Good for Evil.....Father, Forgive Them.
Ps. 109, 2-5; 110, 4; Isai. 53, 12.

2. Casting Lots.....The Parted Garments.
   Ps. 22, 13-18.
3. The Lasting Name.....The Superscription.
   Ps. 72, 17-19.
4. Aha, aha.....Mockeries on Calvary.
   Ps. 22, 6-8; 35, 21; 69, 21.
5. Believe, and Be Saved.....*The Repentant Thief.*
   Numb. 21, 8-9; Isai. 9, 2; 42, 1-7.
6. Threatening Darkness.....Darkness About the Cross.
   Ps. 97, 2; Amos 8, 9.
7. A Sad Complaint.....Why Hast Thou Forsaken Me?
   Ps. 22, 1-2.

SIXTH YEAR.

1. Giving Up the Spirit.....Into Thine hands, etc.
   Ps. 31, 5; Isai. 62, 4.
2. The Shaking Earth.....The Death of Jesus.
   Ps. 18, 4-7; 50, 3-6.
3. The Profaned Sanctuary.....The Veil Rent in Twain.
   Isai. 26, 19; 43, 22-28; Nahum 1, 5-6.
4. The Righteous One.....The Centurion's Confession.
   Ps. 22, 30-31; 98, 2-3; 102, 15; Isai. 60, 3.
5. Mourning for Him.....The Multitudes on Calvary.
   Zech. 12, 10.
6. No Bones Shall be Broken.....The Wounded Side.
   Numb. 9, 12; Ps. 34, 20.
7. Buried with the Rich.....Joseph's Garden.
   53, 9.

Such sermons are bound to make the dim past a living, realistic, practical, instructive preparation for Christ's Passion, granting new views of the Old Testament, and throwing a remarkable light upon the events of Holy Week. The minister who has found those studies profitable, will not forget that the Passion also looks forward and a promising field invites to a series of sermons on the apostolic doctrines related to the Passion in connection with underlying facts. We limit ourselves to a course of three years which again may be altered and extended in many ways.

Three Years on Apostolic Doctrine and the History of the Passion. The word *history* refers first of all to the gospel narrative which must receive fullest attention, but it means also the active influence of the Passion upon the apostolic congregations and down to the third century. How those noble men and women, from the highest dignitary in church and community down to the poorest slave, gladly endured all hardships because their Savior had suffered the same things! With them each detail of the Passion was an ever present reality shaping their conduct and worship. This brings a heroic element into the Passion of Christ and that of his servants after him, almost overwhelming in effect; it touches every phase of life and becomes a powerful appeal to our weakly age.

FIRST YEAR.

Doctrine:	*History:*
1. Christ loved us. Ephes. 5, 2.	Scenes in the Guest Chamber.
2. The new Covenant. Heb. 12, 24.	The Lord's Supper.
3. The Prophet. Acts 3, 22-24.	Farewell Sermons.
4. His Obedience. Phil. 2, 8.	Not My Will Be Done.
5. He Gave Himself. Gal. 1, 4.	The Arrest.
6. Christ Must Suffer. Acts 26, 22-23.	Peter's Sword.
7. The Rulers Condemn Him. Acts 13, 27-29.	Before Annas and Caiaphas.

SECOND YEAR.

1. The Kings of the Earth. Acts 4, 26-28.	Before Pilate and Herod.
2. He reviled not again. I. Pet. 2, 22-23.	The Silent Jesus.
3. Denying the Holy One. Acts 3, 13-15.	Barabbas.

4. The Jews Killed Jesus.....Crucify Him!
   I. Thess. 2, 14-15.
5. Without the Gate.....On the Way to Calvary.
   Heb. 13, 12-13.
6. He Bore Our Sins.....Jesus Bore His Cross.
   I. Pet. 2, 24-25.
7. A Ransom for All.....Jesus the Crucified.
   I. Tim. 2, 5-6.

THIRD YEAR.

1. The Stumbling Block.....Himself He Cannot Help.
   I. Cor. 1, 23-24.
2. Looking Unto Jesus.....John and Mary at the Cross.
   Heb. 12, 2-4.
3. Peace Through His Blood.....It is Finished
   Col. 1, 20-22.
4. Made a Curse.....Taking the Body Away.
   Gal. 3, 13; Col. 2, 14.
5. The Cleansing Blood.....The Open Side.
   Rom. 3, 23-25; I. John 1, 7.
6. He was Buried.....The Burial.
   I. Cor. 15, 3-4; Acts 2, 26-27.
7. Worthy the Lamb.....Meditations at the Tomb.
   Rev. 5, 11-14.

If now a minister has preached on the Passion in every Lent for seventeen years or more, has he exhausted it and is he compelled to seek other sources for live subjects? No, he is not yet done with the noble account of the gospels. In the preaching of the previous years certain important details were necessarily given no more than a passing notice, and holding them separately up to the height new beauties and lessons are met. The following three years' plan is the merest hint as to the possibilities of solid, forceful preaching through many years.

Three Years on Important Details of the Passion. In the first eight years the Suffering Savior was most prominent; in the succeeding six years he stood forth against the mysterious background of God's providence and government; in the next three years he showed his power over his followers; in this last series He turns His searching eye directly upon the individual sinner.

While no Lenten sermon is without it, yet here is the one unsurpassed opportunity of studying the heart, mind, and conscience of man in the surrounding conditions of daily life.

First Year: Take the seven principal actors in the Passion, one for each service: John, Peter, Judas, Annas, Caiaphas, Herod and Pilate. Give a sort of biographical sketch, but in each instance ask and answer the following questions: What part did he take in the Passion and what were his motives? How did he increase or ameliorate the sorrows of the Lord? What did he gain and what did he lose by his conduct? Which of our trials and temptations, of our sins or virtues are equal or similar to his?

Second Year: There are a number of people standing modestly aside, yet each with a mighty sermon for the seven services. The Mother Mary: Women and the Cross. Magdalene: What the cross means to converted souls. Salome: Giving home and family to the Crucified, does it pay? Barabbas: What the Passion did for Criminals—man's *passions,* Christ's Passion, Divine *Com*passion. Centurion: The Passion moves rough men, even Gentiles. Nicodemus: The Passion calls timid believers to the front. Joseph: The Passion opens heart and hand.

Third Year: Making the office, nature, and state of Christ the central idea, special conditions receive their due, as in the following seven themes: The Prophet: His doctrine, piety, and life tested in the Passion. The Priest: His sacrifice affecting himself, his church, false religion, history, etc. The King: All disgrace intended for him turned into glory by him. The Messiah of Israel: The sins of a nation set forth in his last works and sermons and moments. The Son of God: It is astonishing how many things in the Passion seem to contradict his Godhead, and still more marvellous how those same things proclaim his Godhead right then and there. The Son of Man: How he excels the greatest among men in all human perfections just when he was the least among men. The Savior: How the fate of a whole world depended in so many respects on those six hours on Calvary.

VI. CONCLUSION.

Apart from the principal object of the Lenten sermon, which consists in preaching the Savior of sinners to a lost world, many

other valuable results come from such services, of which we mention a few. For instance, a better knowledge of the Bible is imparted. The Passion is that ocean of divine love into which enter the rivers of truth from the Old Testament, and from which issue the streams of life flowing through the epistles of the New Testament. The Passion cannot be preached without giving a wide acquaintance with the Word of God to the congregation. Again, the suffering, dying Christ has always exerted an extraordinary power upon believers and unbelievers alike. Where can one find more effective means to call the erring ones, to strengthen the weak, and to establish the faithful, than by bringing them into full view of the Cross? And another fruit: In our time when so much human righteousness, character-building, true manhood and perfect womanhood are preached while the doctrine of sin and divine pardon is neglected; when Jesus is held up as a pattern but not as a Savior; when at the best the Christ *In* Us is preached, and seldom the Christ *For* Us; it is the mission and the power of the Passion to convince the sinner of the need, of the verity, and of the blessedness of Christ's Atonement. Therefore the loyal Lutheran greets with joy the increasing interest evinced in one of the most precious possessions of his Church: The Lenten service.

Greenville, Ohio.

ARTICLE VIII.

CHARGE TO PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.*

BY JACOB HENRY CULLER, D.D.

President of the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College.

The Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College is to have a permanent addition to its corps of capable and efficient instructors. You, my dear brother, have been elected by the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College to serve in the position designated as the Chair of Symbolics. The Advent Season seems a fitting time for this significant service. We are now assembled to formally induct you into your office. You have been chosen with great unanimity and special heartiness. It is gratifying that it is so. So far as we have been able to learn your election has given satisfaction throughout the Church. You have come to the place God meant for you—the glorious company of the Apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of Martyrs, our fathers of a like precious faith—we long to join hands with them all, and catch the contagion of their heroic confidence. For is it not written in the vital organism of Wittenberg College that it shall not only promote higher Christian education, but that in the prosecution of this work, *"a chief aim shall be the education of young men for the ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church?"* In thinking of how wisely and well the foundations are laid, and how this precious heritage has come to us it is well to remember that, "we begin, with the momentum of other disciplined lives behind us, debtors to a ministering ancestry, and in them to a ministering God." You have not come into an easy place, a position for life, simply, but into a high place of great and increasing opportunity and, to the sincere soul, of solemn responsibility. We congratulate you. Your specific work is to train ministers of the Word for our Church and time, and send them out equipped to bear a living message

* Delivered upon the inauguration of Prof. Neve, as Professor of Symbolics, in the Hamma Divinity School, December 8th. 1910.

to living men—able to command attention and to move men to accept the truth and yield to its high and holy behests. What a privilege is this! How ever widening, unceasing, unlimited is the reach of this your work! Yes, your greatest work may be helping one or more young men in preparation to do a greater work. We cease to wonder that you and your co-laborers in this school of the prophets are here and ready for any reasonable sacrifice when we remember the spiritual attractions of your call and work. You may be sure we too are glad that we discovered you. It is to our advantage that you were born and trained a German. After a residence of more than a score of years in this your adopted land, six of which were spent as a regular pastor and seventeen as a teacher of theology, you are able to rightly analyze existing conditions in our own beloved Church, and in our relation to other Churches. You are not a novice as an instructor in sacred things. We believe you to be a sincere Christian man in whose daily walk and conversation will be exemplified your teaching. The main thing in education is the sympathetic, inspiring contact of the taught with the live, enthusiastic, consecrated teacher. A man of this kind is a legion in himself. There is a power in the devout conscientious life that goes out silently creating a spiriual atmosphere in its presence and its work. Your have given proof of your aptness to teach, not only to think but to set those under your care to think. "A truth that costs no thought, wields no power. Religion has more to fear from unthinking acceptance than from hostile criticism. When faith is too familiar to be thoughtful, it lives by help of the accidents, rather than through possessions of the essentials of truth." In the class-room and intercourse with the students the alert teacher will not overlook the necessity to develop and discipline the mental and spiritual powers of his pupils. Competent use of their knowledge is an end sought in the training you give your students. What they get through your instruction, is that, as ministers of the Word they may be "workmen that need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." We have reason to rejoice in your special fitness for the chair of Symbolics. This subject has always received attention in the course of instruction in our Seminary, but in this day of specialization and because of the ever increasing interest and the importance of this branch of theology in our Church this chair has

been provided. Your experience as editor of a church paper, for several years, your familiarity with the German language and the rich treasures it holds for the student of theology, together with a natural bent of mind and heart and your scholarly equipment and the opportunities and advantages you have had and used, all combine, under the dominion of grace, to eminently qualify you to live and teach in this place to which you have been called. We believe you to be a man of decided convictions with courage to make them known, but with your natural reserve and kindly way to conciliate rather than antagonize in seeking after the truth. It is well to remember that we are Lutherans. That "in our Church Confessions and our forms of Church worship, in which is embodied every possible principle of Christian faith and life we have the grandest heritage of any of God's children on earth." We think you have a keen sense of appreciation of what we possess and that your life and work here will always be characterized by a spirit of loyalty to our Lutheran faith, and fidelity to our Lutheran practice, maintaining the dignity of the Church and the nobility of the Gospel. The young men who go out from this institution are to be fortified against the opposition they are sure to encounter in the everyday active work of the ministry. Your familiarity with the history of Christian doctrine, the formation of doctrinal statements and the cause and construction of symbols of faith and your desire not to fight shy of any difficulty or heresy will be felt by your pupils and communicated in your instruction. The history of old and present day errors, by whatever name or in whatever form they are presented, teaches us, as one of your colleagues has well put it, "to hold on to our faith in the old doctrine of an inspired Bible, in the old ideas of the fall and redemption, the old warnings of judgment and condemnation, the old necessity for faith and regeneration and the wisdom of God as superior to reason as a source of authority in the greatest concerns of life."

And now I conclude, persuaded that we are to soon have in your inaugural address a clear and satisfactory presentation of the subject you have chosen and that there has been no mistake in calling you to this important position in the service of the Church for the extension and upbuilding of the kingdom of our

Lord and Savior in the hearts and lives of the children of men.

"God bless your going out, nor less
Your coming in, and make them sure:
God bless your daily bread, and bless
What'er you do—what'er endure.
In death unto His presence awake you,
And heir to His salvation make you."

Wapakoneta, O.

THE FORMULATION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD'S CONFESSIONAL BASIS.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

As a subject on which to speak on the occasion of my inauguration to the chair of Symbolics in Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, I have chosen a confessional problem which is before the General Synod now. At the last convention held in Richmond, Ind., after the very remarkable "Statements Relative to the General Synod's Doctrinal Basis" prepared by Dr. L. S. Keyser, had been adopted, the following resolution offered by Dr. J. A. Clutz, was passed:[1]

"*Resolved,* That the Common Service Committee be and hereby is instructed to codify the several resolutions and statements explanatory of the Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod, adopted at York, Pa., in 1864; at Hagerstown, Md., in 1895; at Des Moines, Ia., in 1901, and at the present session of the General Synod, and incorporate the substance of the same into one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis, and to report the same at the next meeting of the General Synod with a view to placing it in the Constitution of the General Synod by amendment in the manner prescribed by the Constitution itself, there being no intention in this action in any way to change our present Doctrinal Basis."

1 See Proceedings of the Fourty-forth Convention of the General Synod, in session at Richmond, Ind., June 2-10, 1909. Page 115.

Though not a member of the Common Service Committee I feel sure that it will not be found out of place for me or any other member of the General Synod to present a discussion on this important subject; as I feel also sure that the committee mentioned will welcome any suggestions as to the solution of the problem. For that this task is no easy one will be admitted by every one familiar with the confessional history of our General Synod and the discussions that we have had on that subject in even recent times.

"There being no intention in this action in any way to change our present Doctrinal Basis"—this closing phrase was, at the suggestion of Dr. Keyser, added to the resolution as read by Dr. Clutz. This had reference, as I understand, especially to the thought that outside of the Augsburg Confession none of the other confessional writings shall be included as obligatory in that "one clear and definite statement" which, from the time of its adoption, shall constitute the "Doctrinal Basis" of our General Synod and take the place of the formula heretofore used. On that subject the Richmond Resolutions stated: "As to the Secondary Confessions of the Lutheran Church, the General Synod in no wise ignores, rejects, repudiates or antagonizes them, nor forbids any of her members from accepting all of them, if they so desire. On the other hand, she holds those confessions in high esteem, regards them as a most valuable body of Lutheran belief, explaining and unfolding the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and she hereby recommends that they be diligently studied by our ministers and laymen."[2] Anybody reading these words feels that it would detract from the dignity of the form of confessional subscription, which is to be used at solemn services of the church, at the ordination of ministers, the installation of professors, etc., if we should incorporate any of these words in that formula. They may have their place among the "Explanatory Statements" such as ordered by the last General Synod,[3] but in the nature of the case can not go into that "one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis." So you see there can be no temptation whatever to change the present Doctrinal Basis by including any statement concerning the Secondary Confessions in the form of subscription. For the reason mentioned

2 Minutes, p. 57.
3 See Minn., pp. 59, 60.

even these Richmond statements can not be incorporated in the form of subscription. If there are any among us who are suspicious in this respect, they can dismiss all fear.

To include more than the Augustana as confessionally binding would also be contrary to what the Hagerstown Resolution stated regarding the Augsburg Confession when it said: "Nothing more, nothing less." Only in passing I want to say for the ears of our critics that this is a position that can well be maintained by a Lutheran body. The great majority of Lutheran churches and synods in Europe and America who do not and would not accept more than the Augustana as obligatory, accept without formal subscription to the other symbols the confessionally essential elements in these great historical writings. So does the General Synod to-day. *She cannot do otherwise when accepting the Augsburg Confession ex animo.* What we simply have in mind in limiting our confessional subscription to the Augustana is this: We want to express the thought that a church is justified in distinguishing between the essential and universally acknowledged doctrines of the Lutheran Reformation as they came to an expression in those memorable times when this great religious movement first came to be acknowledged as a church, on the one hand, and, on the other, the elaboration of these doctrines in the form of theological reflection and speculative exhibition. Whatever of these expositions must be regarded, "in the light of the Lutheran regulating principle of justifying faith," *as necessary interpretation of those doctrines,* are, of course, inseparable from the teachings of the Augustana. But they can not claim to be a creed in the same manner as is the Augsburg Confession.[4] That phrase of the Hagerstown Resolution has sometimes been criticized, and it sounds plausible when, for instance, Dr. Jacobs says: "When truth unchallenged at Augsburg are

4. Compare Kahnis, "Christentum und Luthertum" on page 130 concerning the Form of Concord. And p. 136, for instance, he has this to say even of Luther's Small Catechism: "In evangelical truth and consecration as well as in popular simplicity, clearness and power, it surpasses anything that has ever been written in this respect. None of our Confessions have been so written in the spirit of God as must be said of the Small Catechism. And next to the Scriptures no other book has so impressed the hearts of men." And then Kahnis goes on to say: "But as symbolical writings both Catechisms can not claim the authority of the Augsburg Confession." He gives two reasons: 1. because they were not direct testimonies of the Church; 2. according to their purpose they did not give complete expression to the doctrinal character of Lutheranism.

misunderstood and misrepresented, we are not faithful witnesses if we be silent upon the plea that 'we hold to the Augsburg Confession—nothing more, nothing less.'"[5] Certainly we admit that it is the duty of the Church to testify whenever error comes up, and we think that the Form of Concord was the most necessary testimony, but this does not include that such new statement of truth must now, like the Augsburg Confession, become the object of confessional subscription. Some time after the promulgation of the Form of Concord there was a controversy in the Lutheran Church as to how Christ exercised His divine attributes in the state of His humiliation, which was settled by the so-called *Decisio Saxonica.* But while this document contained a very happy statement of the truth, we do not make it an object of confessional subscription. So we in the General Synod say: The Augsburg Confession, nothing more, nothing less. And when we say: "Nothing more" *we do not mean by that to exclude what in the Smalcald Articles and in the Form of Concord is a proper interpretation and a legitimate development of the doctrines of the Augustana.* We simply do not bind our ministers to these Secondary Confessions *in their entirety* and especially not to *the form* in which they state the truth.[6]

Not every age can produce a creed. If it is not a gradual, unconscious growth as in the case of the Apostle's Creed then there must be that inspiration called forth by a great historical occasion, that immense burden of responsibility, that tension and that harmony between many of like faith, which all combined to enable our confessors at Augsburg and particularly Melanchthon, to make those brief lipidary statements of fundamental importance for the doctrinal life of our Church. Prof. Seeberg calls attention to the fact that at the time when the Form of Concord was composed, "the productive period of the Reformation age which alone possessed the ability to give us a creed was about to pass,"[7] and Prof. Kolde feels that it is necessary to admit that

5 *The Lutheran,* March 5th, 1908, p. 403.

6 Luthardt speaks of the truths of the Form of Concord as presented "im theologischen Gewande jener Zeit," "in einer scholastischen Gestalt, die uns jetzt fremdartig erscheint, da wir nicht mehr nach so formalistischer Logik, wie es damals Brauch war, zu denken gewohnt sind, sondern mehr geschichtlich und lebendig zu denken pflegen." Die *"Christl Glaubenslehre* gemeinverstaendlich dargestelit," page 361.

7 Realencyclopaedie3 X, p. 734.

the Form of Concord lacks the pulse beats of a real confession.[8] All this contains our justification for distinguishing between the Augustana and the Secondary Confessions *when it comes to credal subscription.* The General Synod declared at Richmond: "The Augsburg Confession is the original and generic Lutheran Confession, accepted by Luther and his coadjutors, adopted by all Lutheran bodies the world over, and is therefore generally recognized as the adequate and sufficient standard of Lutheran doctrine."[9]

But back again to the theme of our discourse. We wanted to discuss the question: What elements should be embodied in that "one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis?" We will agree on this, that there can be no phrase regarding the Secondary Confessions. All that was said in Richmond concerning them was valuable, inasmuch as it was sufficient to put the General Synod's stamp of disapproval upon utterances many of which we have had in our past history, intended to bring contempt on these most important documents; and valuable also as a testimony over against others who misunderstand our attitude toward the Form of Concord. But since we are not ready to say more and do not wish to make the Secondary Confessions binding, we can incorporate no statement concerning them into our formula.

We proceed to another point regarding the formulation of our Doctrinal Basis. I feel sure that we as a General Synod in mentioning the Augsburg Confession as the symbol on which we place ourselves will be ready to insert the word "unaltered," as employed in the Hagerstown Resolution. Not that we meant anything else in our old formula. But in the confessional history of the Lutheran Church that qualification "unaltered" has come to stand for a conservative theology that means to maintain the genuine Lutheran principles in a number of questions of vital importance. It has special reference to Article X, and also to Articles XVIII and XX, in connection with IV and VI.[10] It can be admitted that there are changes from the original also in the "Invariata," which we can tell by comparing the Latin

8 Historische Einleitung zu Mueller's Symb. Buechern, LXXIII.

9 Min. of 1909, p. 57.

10 Comp. Zoeckler, Die Augsburgische Konfession, pp. 37-39. Schaff. Creeds of Christendom, Vol. I, 240.

Editio princeps with such an exhibition of the harmony of the most reliable manuscripts (preserved in the different archives of Germany) as has been presented us by Prof. Tschackert of Goettingen.[11] But these changes are of no doctrinal importance.[12] Our qualifying the Augustana as "unaltered" simply means a disavowal of the "Variata" of 1540 (and its successors) with its most significant alterations; and not so much at present of the document itself which few know[13] and no Lutheran body to-day adopts formally, but of the Melanchthonian theology back of this document,[14] a theology which labored to bridge over the difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism, and which, in its representatives of a later age, has paved the way for a movement that aims to unite the Lutheran and Reformed churches by treating their doctrinal distinctions, especially regarding the Lord's Supper, as a matter of indifference. The old and much ventilated question of "Variata" and "Invariata" can not here be discussed with the comprehensiveness that it calls for when considered in its bearing on inner-Protestant developments. I have prepared a discourse on this subject which I am to read before the Luther Club of this city, and which may find its way into print. But I am sure that without much additional study of the subject the General Synod will be ready to name the "unaltered" Augsburg Confesion in that "one clear and definite statement of our Doctrinal Basis."

It may not be quite as easy for us to agree as to what shall be done with the phrase "fundamental doctrines." In our present confessional paragraph we say: "And the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition *of the fundamental doctrines* of the divine

11 Die unveraenderte Augsburgische Konfession, deutsch und lateinisch, von P. Tschackert.

12 The men who are so eager to demonstrate that there is no sense in talking of an "unaltered" Augsburg Confession as over against an "altered" edition hope to win their case by writing of the two original copies (Latin and German) which are lost and then telling us of all the "altered" editions (Variatae) beginning with Melanchthon's first edition of 1530-31 (the Editio princeps, our so-called "Invariata" from which the English translation in our Book of Worship is prepared) up to those of 1540 and 1542 and later. So did already Dr. G. G. Weber in his otherwise excellent work: "Kritische Geschichte der Augsburgischen Konfession." But in this way they confuse the question from the beginning.

13 Printed in English translation in Dr. Jacobs' Book of Concord; also Latin in Kolde, Die Augsburgische Konfession mit Beilagen; also in Corp. Reform. Vol. XXVI., pp. 349 sqq.

14 Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, Vol. I, p. 240.

Word." This was qualified by the Des Moines Resolution of 1901 in the following manner: "And we hold that to make any distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis as set forth in our formula of confessional subscription."[15] This same resolution was reiterated at the Richmond convention of our General Synod with great emphasis. It was there said: "She (the General Synod) does not mean that some of the doctrines set forth in the Confession are non-fundamental, and, therefore, may be accepted or rejected; she means that they all are fundamental, and their exhibition in the Confession is to be accepted by those who subscribe to the Confession."[16] And over against those who hold that the confessional resolutions of Hagerstown and Des Moines "do not have the force of confessional amendments, having never been formally adopted by two-thirds of the Synods, according to the constitutional requirement (Art. VI, Sec. 2), and therefore are not a part of the doctrinal basis," the General Synod at Richmond declared "that the section above cited refers only to *alterations* of the General Synod's constitution; but the confessional resolutions referred to are not alterations of the constitution, and contemplate no alterations; they are simply explanations of the meaning of the General Synod's confessional basis. Therefore it is not necessary to submit them to the District Synods of the General Synod. Inasmuch then as they were passed by the General Synod in regular session and have never been revoked by this body, they therefore become and remain a part of the confessional assets of the General Synod."[17] And then the resolution was passed by which, among other declarations, it was provided that this Des Moines Resolution also shall "with headings prefixed, be printed in all future editions of the Augsburg Confession published by the General Synod, whether issued in separate form or in our Books of Worship and that they be inserted immediately after the York Resolution." (p. 59). This is certainly in unmistakable language a declaration of how the phrase "fundamental doctrines" is not to be interpreted as well as how it must be understood. And now there is the instruction given at Richmond to codify the several reso-

15 See Minutes, 1901, p. 83.
16 Minutes of 1909, p. 57.
17 Min. p. 85.

lutions and statements explanatory of the Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod.....and to "incorporate the substance of the same into one clear and definite statement." The history of our confessional development demands a recognition of this declaration in the Des Moines Resolution. But how shall it be done? By retaining the phrase "fundamental doctrines" and defining it according to the Des Moines interpretation, or by omitting it altogether?

In starting out to discuss this matter let me say: We in the General Synod do not any more understand the words "fundamental doctrines" as our fathers did. They meant, by employing this phrase, to limit the obligation to those parts of the Augsburg Confession which treat of such doctrines of God's Word as are of fundamental character. That there could be no thought of accepting the whole Augustana, every doctrine in it, as confessionally binding, was to them a matter on which there ought to be no dispute. So convinced they were that even concerning the fundamental doctrines of the Word of God they did not risk to state more than that they were taught in the Augsburg Confession "in a manner substantially correct." This very objectionable phrase was, it is true, removed at the meeting of the General Synod in Harrisburg (1868), but in the words substituted the phrase "fundamental doctrines" was retained. How this phrase was understood we can learn from contemporaneous writing on the confessional question. Permit me to adduce a few testimonies.

Dr. S. S. Schmucker was the man who put the words "fundamental doctrines" into all the earlier documents of the General Synod. These words were so important to him that he had them underscored with pen and ink in the books which he used, and he printed them in italics in his publications. His writings abound with assertions that the General Synod employed this phrase in order to indicate that the confessional obligation of her members should be restricted to the *fundamental* doctrines of the Scriptures only; and in connection with such statements he excepted whole articles of the Augustana and parts of some as not containing fundamental doctrines of God's Word. The Lutheran conception of the Lord's Supper he regarded as not fundamental, and Art. X was therefore not confessionally binding.

The Rev. Dr. Harkey preached, in 1859, an official sermon be-

fore the General Synod, which afterwards was published by a unanimous vote of this body. In that sermon the following words occur: "How has the General Synod adopted the Augsburg Confession? How could she adopt it with the hope of uniting the Lutherans in America, and not burden the consciences of any good men among us? I reply, there was only one way possible, and as a matter of course she must take that plan. She adopted it as to *fundamentals,* and to these she requires unqualified subscription. Objections have been urged against the expression 'fundamental doctrines' as meaning one thing in the mouth of one man, and a different thing in the mouth of another; that to some everything is fundamental, and to others only a few points. Now I can not reply to this at length, at present, but have only to say in a few words, *that there are fundamental doctrines* in Christianity, and everybody not spoiled by his theory or philosophy knows what they are."[18] We certainly agree with Dr. Harkey that there are fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines in Christianity, but what interests us here is his declaration, endorsed by the General Synod that "she adopted it (the Augustana) as to fundamentals." And we need to remember that when the General Synod voted to publish this sermon she had among its members men like Drs. Mann, Krauth and Schaeffer, afterwards professors in the General Council's seminary in Philadelphia. It shows that at that time it was a conviction common to all that in the adoption of the Augustana there should be a distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals.

And let me quote Charles Porterfield Krauth at a time when he was yet a member of the General Synod. In 1864 he wrote: "She (the General Synod) satisfied herself, therefore, with an affirmative about fundamentals, making neither an affirmation nor a denial in regard to non-fundamentals. She left the synods in absolute freedom in non-fundamentals, freedom to doubt, to reject and to *receive* them." And to make sure that Dr. Krauth did not mean simply non-fundamental and non-essential "features," such as errors in quotation and other unimportant matters,[19] but non-fundamental *doctrines,* I quote from the same article: "Brethren may differ as to whether the non-fun-

18 Lutheran Quarterly 1895, p. 477.

19 Comp. Prof. Kawerau's letter in the Holman Lecture in July number of LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, 1909, p. 330.

damental doctrines, as well as the fundamental doctrines, are correctly stated in the Confession. Let them differ. We make no decision whatever as to that point. Both agree as to *fundamentals.* Therefore fundamentals only shall be the object of this subscription. We affirm of them that they are taught correctly in the Confession. Of the non-fundamentals we affirm nothing, and deny nothing. Neither their reception nor their rejection has anything to do with this basis."[20] The only article which Dr. Krauth excepted among the first twenty-one, from confessional obligation was Article XI on Confession. He says: "They are, in their main tenor fundamental to Evangelical Protestantism, and to the Reformation itself, with the exception of Article XI which is neither fundamental to Protestantism nor to Lutheranism.[21]

I want it understood that I am not offering these quotations to prove that there shall be confessional obligation to only part of the Augustana. What I want to show is simply how the leading men of the General Synod, in a former time, interpreted the phrase "fundamental doctrines." Dr. Krauth modified his conception soon after the publication of these articles.

Let me quote one witness more, a man of influence in the General Synod, the acknowledged leader in the critical time after the separation of 1866, I mean Dr. J. A. Brown, Professor of Theology at Gettysburg. He also discriminated between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines of the Augustana. In the Allentown Church Case, in 1875, he testified as follows, in answer to the question: "What are the fundamental doctrines of the Augsburg Confession?"

"A full and definite answer to this question is hardly possible, or even practicable, as the Confession embraces twenty-eight distinct articles,. . . .but the central doctrine is that of justification by faith alone in Jesus Christ, and all doctrines centering around this one are regarded as fundamental. I answer that I consider that the First Article contains a fundamental doctrine on the Godhead; the Second Article is fundamental on Sin; the Third Article is fundamental on the person and work of the Son of God; the Fourth Article is fundamental; Fifth Article, on the Ministry, containing a fundamental doctrine; Sixth Article, on

20 *Lutheran and Missionary,* March 31, 1864.
21 *Lutheran and Missionary,* April 21.

New Obedience, fundamental; Seventh Article, of the Church, containing fundamental doctrines; Eleventh Article of Confession, not fundamental so far as confession and private absolution are concerned; Article Twelfth, of Repentance, contains a fundamental doctrine; Article Thirteenth, of the Use of the Sacraments, contains a fundamental doctrine; Article Fourteenth, of Church Government, fundamental as far as good order in the church is concerned; Article Fifteenth, of Church Rites and Ordinances, contains Fundamental truths; Article Sixteenth, of Civil Polity and Government, contains things fundamental and non-fundamental; Article Seventeenth, fundamental; Article Eighteenth contains fundamental doctrines; Article Nineteenth may be called fundamental; Articles Twenty and Twenty-first contain fundamental doctrines."

So then Dr. Brown counted among the first twenty-one articles only seven as fundamental, one as non-fundamental, one as partly fundamental and partly non-fundamental, and all the others such as contain doctrines of fundamental character.

Dr. Brown was a conservative, reliable theologian, and his theory would not have been so very objectionable if it had not been given in connection with the confessional formula of the General Synod: "the Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word." But thus great parts of the Augustana were not included in the confessional subscription. And as other men might hold a much less conservative theory as to what parts of the Augustana are fundamental and what not, our confessional formula as we have it since 1869[22] would be an obligation that is no obligation. During the confessional controversies in connection with adopting the Common Service, Catechism and Ministerial Acts there were all kinds of radical expressions as to statements in the Augustana that did not come within the scope of the General Synod's confessional subscription. Emphasis was always laid on the words: "*fundamental* doctrines;" it was said that such doctrines of the Augsburg Confession as could not claim the character "fundamental" were not meant to be binding. This was the motive of the Des Moines Resolution with its declaration: "And we hold that to make any distinction between fundamental and

22 The final adoption of it took place at the meeting of the General Synod in Washington,, D. C.

so-called non-fundamental doctrines in the Augsburg Confession is contrary to that basis as set forth in our formula of confessional subscription."

This brief review of our General Synod's confessional history shows us the importance of the Des Moines Resolution. Its intention is to fix the interpretation of a somewhat ambiguous phrase in our confessional formula. It is of such importance that it must in some way be recognized in that codification of the essential elements of our different confessional statements, as ordered by the Richmond Resolution. But how shall it be done? We could not take that sentence in the Des Moines Resolution as it there reads. Anything polemical or apologetical would throw an undignified element into that formula which must carefully be kept adapted for use in the sanctuary. Our formula must be a testimony and nothing else. How can it be done?

I would suggest that we choose a form which declares the unqualified adherence to the Augustana without saying anything of the "fundamental doctrines of the divine Word." The mere fact that we have been discussing the meaning of this phrase from the time when we received it up to this day is certainly strong reason why we should now, at a time when the General Synod orders a restatement, decide in favor of something that can not be interpreted in two or more different ways. I confess that I have pondered over this phrase for almost a quarter of a century, and I do not know what it means to-day. I know how it was understood by the fathers of our General Synod, and I know the interpretation of the Des Moines Resolution. But I am at a loss when I am to tell what the only legitimate meaning of the word is. Permit me to enumerate the interpretations which with more or less authority could be given and have been given, and let me add a few critical remarks as we go along:

1. We confess that the Augsburg Confession is a correct exhibition of the *fundamental* doctrines of the divine Word; not where it deals with *non-fundamental* doctrines of the Scriptures. So Dr. Krauth—in his earlier period—as well as Dr. S. S. Schmucker, but with this difference between them, that Dr. Schmucker took "fundamental" with reference to Christianity in general, thus excepting even the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence and holding practically not more than the Nine Points

of the Evangelical Alliance,* while Dr. Krauth took "fundamental" in reference particularly to the life and stability of the Lutheran Church, thus permitting him to except from the first twenty-one articles only Article XI, on Confession.

2. Another interpretation of our formula is that all doctrines of the Augustana are fundamental in some way. There is no inference as to non-fundamental doctrines that may be excepted from obligation. There may be non-fundamental "features" of the Confession, (errors in quotation, the conception of three sacraments instead of two as it appears especially in comparison with Melanchthon's statement in the Apology, lack of clearness as to rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation in Art. X, overstatements for conciliatory purposes as in the close of Art. XXI etc.), which of course can not be included in confessional subscription. The words of our formula: "The Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word" simply intend to say that the Augustana is a correct exhibition of the *principal* articles of faith, the *chief points;* as much as to say: "There are other doctrines of the divine Word not here exhibited, but these are the principal ones, the *fundamental* ones," about in the sense of the concluding words

* 1. Divine Inspiration, authority and sufficiency of the Scriptures. 2. Right and duty of man's own judgment in interpreting the Scriptures. 3. God one essence in three persons. 4. Total depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall. 5. The incarnation of the Son of God, His work of redemption for sinful mankind, his offices as Mediator and King. 6. Justification of the sinner by grace alone. 7. The work of the Holy Spirit in converting and sanctifying the sinner. 8. Immortality of the soul, resurrection of the body, judgment through the Saviour with eternal bliss for the just and eternal damnation for the Godless. 9. Divine institution of ministry and sacraments, Baptism and Lord's Supper. We note the striking similarity with our Augustana as far as the subjects are concerned; but how different from the Augustana is this "program," if we consider that as soon as it came to the details it had to be kept broad enough not to conflict with the views of the Reformed, the Methodist and even Baptists. If we think of Dr. Schmucker's deep interest in the Evangelical Alliance of which he was one of the founders—then we can understand how his conception of what was fundamental, in connection with the General Synod's formula of confessional subscription, would lead him to select from the Augustana as confessionally binding the doctrines that we have in common with other churches. Compare in connection with this an article in the *Lutheran Observer* of April 10th, 1896: "Are the Distinctive Doctrines of the Lutheran Church Fundamental?" The author reaches the conclusion that they are fundamental neither to salvation, nor to sound orthodoxy, nor to a complete system of denominational theology. He closes his article with the following words: "It is all right for those who believe these doctrines to teach them to others, and seek to lead them to accept them; but to *require* this of any as essential, in any sense, is a violation of the spirit of Christian liberty."

in the Confession: "These are the chief articles which seem to be in controversy;" "we have set forth the chief points," etc.[23] This is a view that can well go together with the Des Moines Resolution and if we could be sure that the words "fundamental doctrines" in our formula would always be understood in this way, we might leave that formula just as it is. Anyone who puts this construction on the words "fundamental doctrines" can be an honest subscriber to the Augsburg Confession. But to this interpretation there are several objections in my mind that I can never get rid of:

First. This view has the history of the General Synod against it. Men who were present at the convention of the General Synod in Harrisburg (1868) say that it was the intention to have a distinction made between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines. Concerning the fundamental doctrines they were ready to remove the "substantially correct" clause, but the idea of a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines in the Augustana was so deeply rooted in their minds at that time that they would have had no thought of removing it. We know the views of Drs. Stuckenberg, Harkey, Sprecher, Schmucker and Brown; and these men, as a committee, brought in the final report.[24] We know that in 1875, that is seven years after the adoption of our formula in Harrisburg, Dr. Brown testified in the Allentown Church Case in favor of a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines in the Augustana, counting among the first twenty-one articles seven as fundamental, one as non-fundamental, and the rest as containing a fundamental doctrine, with the express mention of one, Art. XVI, as containing things fundamental and non-fundamental.

Second. It is held by those who take this view that the difficulty disappears as soon as we remember that our formula does not speak of "fundamental doctrines" *of the Augsburg Confession,* but *"of the divine Word,"* and that the emphasis must be laid upon the words: "and the Augsburg Confession *a correct exhibition* of, etc." But then others come and say that they have just the same right to paraphrase it thus: The Augsburg Con-

23 This position is ably represented in the book: "Trial of L. A. Gotwald, p. 61; and in an article of Dr. L. S. Keyser in LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1897.

24 Comp. LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, 1895, p. 481.

fession a correct exhibition only in the cases where this Confession touches upon a fundamental doctrine of the divine Word.

Third. We must not forget that the phrase "fundamental doctrines" has received a certain fixed meaning in theology. The old Dogmaticians of the Lutheran Church (especially Nicol. Hunnius) formulated an elaborate system of things fundamental and non-fundamental.[25] We can not employ this phrase "fundamental doctrines" with the intention of interpreting it in such a general way: "the chief doctrines," the "most important," etc. *These words can not be dissociated from the meaning which they have in the history of doctrines.*

Fourth. These last remarks lead me to a thought which I can never suppress: If, according to the Des Moines Resolution, there shall be no distinction made between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, and if the words "fundamental doctrines" in our formula shall simply mean "the chief," "the most vital" doctrines of God's Word, what purpose is there then in employing these words in a confessional formula where every word must have a distinct, important meaning? Then it is an entirely superfluous phrase, and it would certainly be a pity that there has been so much discussion about it. For that only "the chief" doctrines of God's Word have been exhibited in the Augustana is so self-evident that *it needs not to be mentioned.* Such is an instruction for the class room in a Theological Seminary, but no element important enough to be embodied in a confessional form of subscription.

In concluding my critical remarks on this point let me say: I am heartily in sympathy with the intention of the Des Moines Resolution to guard against an adoption of the Augsburg Confession which after all leaves to the liberty of the individual what he wants to adopt and what not. But *as to the efforts at reconciling* this Des Moines Resolution with the phraseology of our present form of subscription and particularly with the interpretation with which our formula was accepted in Harrisburg I could never help but feel that they are after all nothing more than very laudable endeavors to make the best of the actual situation.

3. Speaking of the different interpretations to which the

25 Comp. Meusel, Kirchl. Handlexikon, Vol. I, p. 217.

phrase under discussion in our formula has been subjected let me call your attention to the force of the *article*: "the Augsburg Confession a correct exhibition of *the* fundamental doctrines of the divine Word." I have always found that this raised in the minds of my students this question: Does then the Augustana contain all fundamental truth of the Scriptures? Are the doctrines which we have in the Augustana fundamental and those doctrines of the Scriptures which have not been expressed in the Confession, not fundamental? De we here have a complete system, or body, or compendium of that which is fundamental in the Bible?[26] Of course, we have no such summary of all that is fundamental in the Scriptures in the Augustana. It was not intended. Our Reformers simply wanted to offer the "chief articles *which seem to be in controversy.*" . .Let me quote some very instructive remarks of Dr. H. E. Jacobs on this question:

"Its doctrinal articles do not cover the whole compass of Christian teaching. The doctrinal portion, which ultimately became the most important portion of the Confession, was at first intended to be only a brief preface to the arraignment of abuses in the Papacy, to the preparation of which the Reformers had given their first attention. The "preface" grew, as successive misrepresentations of the Lutheran teaching, circulated at Augsburg, were found to require an answer, and that answer was given by summarizing what, on these misrepresented points, the Lutherans were actually teaching. If there had not been fanatics at Nuremberg and elsewhere in the Lutheran dominions, who repudiated the doctrine of the Trinity, and whose errors were charged to Lutheran influence, the Confession would not have contained the scientific statement of this doctrine, with which it opens. Dr. John Eck, in his 404 Theses, in circulation at Augsburg openly charged the Lutherans with the aberrations of Zwingli, concerning Original Sin. The answer was the second article, so triumphantly planting the Lutherans upon the Augustinian position, that the Roman Catholic doctors feel themselves constrained in the Confutation to come to the aid of that Pelagianism, which they had, to an extent, in common with Zwingli. In the same way each of the other articles had its

26 Note, how it may change the meaning, if you say the same, but leave out the article. Dr. L. A. Gotwald formulated his adoption of the Augustana in this way: "I accept the Augsburg Confession, as in every article, a correct exhibition of fundamental divine truth." Trial of, etc., p. 51.

historical justification, and must be interpreted upon the historical background of the demands of the hour in which this great Confession was written. Every word was called out by the circumstances. Melanchthon was a consummate master of the art of diplomacy, and knew well how to be silent, as well as how to express himself. The purpose of the Augustana was irenical. The effort was made to reduce the points of difference to the least amount. *General terms mark more than one passage where it was hoped to bridge over an opening chasm.* The *scholastic terminology* was called into requisition to gratify opponents. The Confession was intended to prepare the way for a discussion in which the author was not without hope of winning over his adversaries. We know how it was written and re-written and again re-written, how it was amended and enlarged, and filed and polished, until the very moment that it was called for. If the Emperor had come to Augsburg ten days earlier, or if he had delayed ten days later, we would have had, in many respects, a different Confession."—*The Lutheran,* March 5, 1908.

While we can agree with these remarks, we may yet say that one can overdo it in emphasizing that the Augustana contains nothing that was not "called out by the circumstances." This Confession covers wonderfully the field of the most essential doctrines, so that we after all have an excellent "compass of Christian teaching."[27] But we would never be justified in limiting the "fundamental doctrines" of the divine Word to the articles of the Augsburg Confession. Yet such is a thought suggested by our Formula.

4. It is a fact that our laymen and many of our ministers take the words "fundamental doctrines" to mean: fundamental *for salvation.* This conception is so deeply rooted in the minds of many that it will always stand in their way of catching what the synod wants to convey by that phrase. Then they argue: Is belief in the doctrine of the Trinity necessary for salvation? Is baptismal regeneration, as taught in Art. II together with Art. IX? Is the Real Presence? And so on. This delicate question regarding fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines,

27 See Zoeckler, Die Augsburgische Konfession, p. 95. Also the Analysis given by Dr. Richard in his Confessional History, pp. 104-122.

which calls for so much instruction and discrimination must not be suggested by the Doctrinal Basis of a synod.[28]

So we have seen that our Formula can be and has been interpreted in four different ways. But we are sure that the Confessional paragraph of a synod must be in such a form that it bears but one interpretation. There must be no ambiguity as to its meaning.

These constantly recurring discussions about the meaning of our Doctrinal Basis have a harmful effect upon the life of our synod. Some take a stricter view, others think that they must champion the old. It fosters a factional spirit and revives a great deal that now should be forgotten.

Brethren, I feel that there is a responsibility upon the General Synod now. If we do not settle this matter right we will permit an element that calls for a correction some time to drag along through another generation, an element that will, as it has done in the past, exert a confusing influence upon our General Synod in confessional matters.

If some one should object that the elimination of this phrase, in its historical meaning, would be a "change of our present Doctrinal Basis" of which there was "no intention" in that Richmond action, the reply must be given: Then the Des Moines Resolution is a change. If the Des Moines Resolution is simply an explanation of the meaning of the General Synod's confessional basis (of the meaning it must have to-day), then the elimination of a phrase which has become superfluous by that resolution is no alteration of our Basis.

The General Synod cannot now disown the Des Moines Resolution. Timidly as it came in there among resolutions of a different character, it meant a great step foreward in our confessional development. A really Lutheran body cannot declare the Augustana binding only in respect to "the *fundamental* doctrines of the divine Word." What is fundamental and what is not fundamental? This is a difficult question. Philippi and Frank have here not the same views as the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century, and a Lutheran theologian like Luthardt again differs from Philippi and Frank. Let us remember also that Lutheranism is not a foundation, it is a structure. If I buy a

28 Read Luthardt, Die christliche Glaubenslehre, gemeinverstaendlich dargestellt, p. 88.

building, I buy the whole of it, not the foundation only. Whether all articles of the Augustana are fundamental or whether some or parts of them are non-fundamental—this is a question that never troubles me much. The answer depends on our definition of the term "fundamental." I accept all in the Augustana that has, in any way, the character of *confessional substance.* This is the only distinction that we can make, the distinction between confessional and non-confessional substance. Most of those among us who insist upon the term "fundamental doctrines," because it suggests and admits the idea of non-fundamentals in the Augustana, do not really mean to except *doctrines* of the Augustana from confessional obligation. When they speak of non-fundamentals they think of all those little things which, in the nature of the case, do not claim to be "confessional substance." There is much more agreement among us on these matters than there sometimes seem to be.

Having now come to the close of this discourse I will sum up the suggestions made:

1. To the Scriptures must be given the priority, the precedence, the position of absolute authority as was done in our old formula. Let us keep this part as it reads, with the only change that we declare the Scriptures to *"be"* the Word of God instead of *"containing"* it, in accordance with the Richmond Resolutions.[29]

2. As suggested by the Hagerstown Resolution let us qualify the Augsburg Confession by the term "unaltered."[30]

3. Let us eliminate anything that suggests a distinction between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines of the Augustana.[31]

4. Let us not burden our formula with all the detailed declarations of the York and Richmond Resolutions concerning special doctrines of the Augustana, and concerning our attitude to the Secondary Confessions. The unaltered Augsburg Confession cannot be honestly accepted without including what the Secondary Confessions contain as legitimate interpretation of the great generic symbol of the Lutheran Church.

Beyond these suggestions I refuse to go at the present time.

29 See Min., 1909, p. 58, 4 and p. 60, IV.
30 See Min. 1895, p. 62.
31 See Min. 1901, p. 83.

because the General Synod has instructed its Committee on Common Service to bring in a report as to how this Doctrinal Basis might be formulated.

Only one word in closing. With all our work of arriving at a proper formulation of our confessional basis we will not forget that while it is important to be formally correct—there is a great educational value in a correct and adequate Doctrinal Basis—yet it is of greater importance for any Lutheran body really to appropriate the confessional principles of our great church. Therefore let us study our confessions, let us study them at our conferences, in our ministerial meetings, in connection with our practical work. If I was to take charge of a congregation I would use in connection with the making of my sermons the Book of Concord, being guided by its index to find out how each one of our confessions expresses the conception of a doctrinal idea that comes within the scope of my preaching. What a wealth of doctrinal and ethical expressions in Luther's Larger Catechism alone! And the confessions of our Church should be studied in connection with Luther's writings, especially his Postils, and in connection with other productions of Lutheran authors of the same character. This will help us more and more to understand the confessional principles of the Augsburg Confession which we adopt.

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The Expositor for Oct., 1910, contains an interesting article from the pen of E. Walter Maunder of the Royal Observatory, on "A Misinterpreted Miracle," referring to that record in Joshua concerning the standing still of the sun and moon.

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon;
And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.
And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,
Until the nations had avenged themselves of their enemies.
Is it not written in the book of Joshua?
And sun stayed in the midst of heaven,
And hasted not to go down about a whole day." Joshua 10:12-13.

Mr. Maunder is an astronomer and also a devout believer. He has studied the problem from the standpoint of astronomy, of geography, of Hebrew, and of the narrative itself, and has come to the conclusion that the marginal rendering for "stand still," viz, "be silent," is correct, and that Joshua prayed for an abatement of the fierce heat at mid-day, and that the Lord answered him by sending a cloud and a terrific hail storm, which wrought havic among the enemies of Israel and only cooled the air for the latter, so that they were enabled to pursue the fleeing Amorites "and traversed in the seven hours of the afternoon a distance which under ordinary circumstances would have been the work of an entire day."

In the same number of *The Expositor* Prof. Erdmans, of Leiden, Holland, in discussing "Ezra and the Priestly Code," declares that "the current theory about the exilic and post-exilic origin of all the laws assigned to P can not be maintained. The greater part of the laws of P must be much older than is usually assumed. It is very remarkable that our canon does not contain the Book of the Law that Ezra is said to have brought with him. I think this is an argument for the thesis that the greater part of the laws contained in our laws are older than Ezra. It

seems that only the additions to these laws that were inserted in the manuscripts have been admitted into the canon. If we think of the great honor in which Ezra was held by the successive generations of priests and scribes it is astonishing that his book is lost. Even if his laws are not handed down to us, it will be safe not to underrate the antiquity of the laws preserved by the Israelitic traditions."

Dr. Clyde W. Votaw of the University of Chicago, in the October *American Journal of Theology* discusses "Four Principles Underlying Religious Education," which are as follows: 1. Religion is the primary element in life; 2. All education is to be primarily moral-religious in aim; 3. The materials of religious education are discriminatingly inclusive; 4. The need of the child determines what is educationally to be done for him.

Frances H. Low of London, in the October *Hibbert Journal* objects to "Woman Suffrage," which is now so vigorously pressed in England, on two principal grounds: First, "There can be nothing more fatal for the nation than that women should be transformed into ardent political partisans. Women should have a moral force to be exercised at all times through the individual, the home and the society—a force higher than that wielded by any party and able to make itself felt, collectively if need be, in times of national danger. Secondly, the immediate and inevitable result of the vote would be to turn all reform, all personal effort into political questions, political movements."

The same number of the *Hibbert Journal* contains three articles on psychological themes: 1. A Dual Consciousness, 2. Philosophical Theories on Psychical Research, 3. The Fallacy of the Social Psychologist. All of these articles impress one with the thought that we have made slow progress in understanding our own minds, that there are still many unsounded depths in the realm of spirit.

The December *North American Review* contains an article by Dr. Philip Stafford Moxom on "The Child and Social Reform." He lays great stress on environment which ought to consist in (1) a good home, (2) a good school, (3) a good city (social life), and (4) a good church. He holds that the present agen-

cies are entirely adequate if properly applied. "The Church stands for the magnificent undertaking of the salvation of the world. Let us save one whole generation and its task will be enormously reduced and simplified. Can it be done? Dr. Bernardo, the founder of homes for waifs in London, out of 9556 in a given time lost only 1.84 per cent., that is out of every hundred all but a fraction less than two were saved What does this mean? The Church prays for the coming of God's Kingdom on earth, and the logic of experience is teaching it that the Kingdom of God will come on earth only through the gateway of childhood."

Prof. J. L. Kessler, Ph.D., of Baylor University, in the October *Review and Expositor* discusses "The Preacher and Biology." He holds that methods of biology and those of theology are not incompatible, that students in both branches must be sincere and must seek nothing but truth. He deprecates all efforts to depreciate the honesty of men seeking light. He sees in the prodigious labors of biblical scholars along the line of textual criticism the true scientific spirit. Personal religion is experience, and experience is a biological phenomenon. The new birth in religion, conversion, "biology now considers no longer alien but natural.... a merging of self into a larger personality..... In other words, the unconverted are the abnormal and pathological, suffering from the effects of arrested development." "The biological view of nature includes God in it."

"Miracles and History," by Professor William Hallock Johnson in the October *"Princeton Review,"* is an able discussion of a subject of lasting interest. The historian is bound to weigh the evidence for miracle as offered by the indubitable testimony of the sacred writers. He, however, must be a theist to give this testimony its true value. This evidence seems conclusive in favor of miracles. They can not be explained away by the attempted interpretations of naturalism or of those who think that they must be apologized for. "The question of miracles is not indifferent. 'It is not miracles that matter,' Harnack has said, 'the question on which everything turns is whether we are helplessly yoked to an inexorable necessity, or whether a God exists who rules and governs, and whose power to compel nature we

can move by prayer and make a part of our experience.' It is precisely here that miracle becomes a support to theistic faith, for it answers this important question and answers it unmistakably in the affirmative."

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M.

Formal completeness demands a review this quarter of recent publications in the various departments of Old Testament. Though there have been no startling discoveries and no very unusual propositions of theories in Old Testament study, there have yet been interesting developments of late and a general advance along the whole line of investigation is manifest. The decided trend at present is to lay greatest stress upon the investigation of comparative religions in their bearing upon the Old Testament. The influence of the religio-historical school as a distinct theological method has for some time made itself felt in the department of Old Testament and is without doubt the most important factor now to be reckoned with.

Our review of current theology and thought pertaining to the Old Testament must begin with the chronicle of the death of a highly merited scholar in a field closely connected with the Old Testament. Emil Schürer of Göttingen passed away on April 30th. This is one of six important losses recently sustained by the ranks of investigators in the field of Jewish literature. Bruno Baentsch (Jena) and Justus Köberle (Rostock) died in 1908; Adelbert Merx (Heidelberg) and Adolph Kamphausen (Bonn) in 1909; and now Emil Kautzsch (Halle) and Emil Schürer in 1910. Schürer's chief merit lay in his thorough and exhaustive work, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3 vols., 4th edition, 1907), and in his joint-editorship with Harnack of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*. His position on the editorial staff of this paper was at once upon his death assumed by his son-in-law Herman Schuster and by Arthur Titius (Göttingen) and it was announced that Harnack would withdraw from the staff at the end of this year. At the same time the readers were assured that the inner continuity of the paper would be preserved and that the dominating spirit would be in entire conformity with its past. But in a November number the editors address a lengthy letter to their readers

and ask whether something could not be done to make the paper conform even more than at present with the constantly progressive spirit of modern investigation. The answer is this: "We are deeply impressed with the fact that the method of historical religion has attained a very special significance in every department of scientific theology. We regard it imperative, therefore, that we should thoroughly orientate our readers on this aspect of theology by means of critical reviews covering this entire field." This is a sign of the times.

Schürer though practically unrivaled in his chosen field leaves behind him an able corps of workers along the same line. The literature of late Judaism and the history of the Diaspora are assiduously investigated to-day along three lines of inquiry, in Egypt, in Babylon, and in Palestine, even as the primitive Hebrew origins are sought for in these three places. A significant contribution has recently been made to the sources of our information concerning the Jews in Egypt. It consists of three noteworthy papyri discovered by Rubenson at Elephantine on the site of the ancient Jeb and just across the Nile from the ancient Assuan where Sayce and Cowley not long since discovered the family archives of a prominent Jewish family of the sixth century B. C. The Rubenson documents are in Aramaic, are dated 408-407, and comprise (a) a copy of a letter written by the priest Jedoniah and his colleagues in the fortress Jeb and directed to Bagoas the Persian governor in Judea, (b) an incomplete duplicate of the letter, and (c) a brief sketch of a semi-official answer to the letter.

The story told by these documents is this: the Jewish community in Jeb ignoring the deuteromic law had built its own temple before Cambyses conquered Egypt in 525. While the form of this temple cannot be determined with precision, it is certain that it differed essentially from the one in Jerusalem. Cambyses at the time of his conquest destroyed all the temples of the Egyptians but spared that of the Jews. The Egyptian priests therefore regarded the Jewish cult with extreme scorn and in 411 in the absence of the Persian governor Arsham, the priests of the god Chnub in Elephantine conspired with the commander of the fortress and destroyed the Jewish temple there. The malefactors were soon brought to justice and executed but the temple was not rebuilt. The Jews had therefore applied to

the high priest Jochanan in Jerusalem but had received no assistance (doubtless on the ground that they were schismatics). They now apply to Bagoas the Persian governor in Jerusalem and at the same time to the sons of Sanballat the governor in Samaria. These efforts meet with success and the answer signed by Bagoas and Delaiah, one of the sons of Sanballat, directs Arsham the governor of Elephantine to rebuild the Jewish temple, it being stipulated that the offerings made in the new building shall consist only of food and incense and not of animals (doubtless because the sacrifice of animals which in this case would consist chiefly of rams was specially offensive to the worshippers of Chnub).

These papyri have been carefully edited by Smend and Staerk, published by Lietzmann, translated by Sachau, and commented on at some length by Schürer, Gunkel, Bousset, and many others. They are held to constitute a valuable source of information concerning the history of late Judaism, especially concerning the Egyptian Diaspora of the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ, and to justify a much earlier dating of that Diaspora than has hitherto been considered justifiable. New historical perspectives are opened to view. Much light is shed upon Jewish customs and ideas in the sixth and fifth centuries. The prophecy of Isaiah 19:18 sqq. concerning Egypt and his protest against the building of temples, chapter 66, are set in clear light and need no longer be referred to so late a date as the Maccabean or the Samaritan time. The Jahveh cult existed in Egypt as early as the middle of the sixth century and that too with its own temple. In short, taken together with the recent valuable discoveries of the Americans at Nippur these Elephantine documents would seem to warrant the conclusion that ever since the Babylonian exile Judaism had three distinct centers of existence: Judea, Egypt, and Babylon.

The problem of Hebrew origins finds many suggested solutions, the latest being that of our own Dr. Clay in his "Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites" (*vide* LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. XL, p. 275 sqq.). Of course the largest number of scholars are still interested in tracing the connections between the civilization of Babylon and that of the Israelites. Prof. Clay's theory has not had time as yet to make much impression upon the Germans, although it has not passed without flatter-

ing notice. In a lengthy appreciative review of the book in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* of Oct. 28, 1910, König calls attention to the epoch-making significance of the new theory if well grounded, but expresses his own scepticism as to Clay's results and asks for time for independent investigation of the matter. So that for the present the astral-mythological interpretation of Hebrew origins still holds the field of interest. But the monotony of Pan-Babylonianism has been effectually disturbed occasionally by those who claim even greater dependence of Israel upon the intellectual and religious life of Egypt than upon that of Babylon. And it is just possible that we shall soon witness the spectacle of a virulent struggle over Israel by the Pan-Babylonists on the one hand and the Pan-Egyptists on the other, and unless they succeed in effectually maiming or devouring each other, Israel may be compelled once more to go into exile, mostly to Babylon but a remnant to Egypt.

The Egyptian hypothesis finds a typical representative in Völter's *Aegypten und die Bibel,* which has just appeared in a revised fourth edition. The Excavations at Tell-el-Mutesselim (Megiddo), he claims, have revealed that until the beginning of the eighth century B. C. the predominating influence in Palestine was not Babylonian or Assyrian but Phoenician, Mycenaen, and, above all, Egyptian. This last he shows then in the primitive narratives of the Old Testament. Egyptian mythology furnishes the material which when wrought into the narrative form of history constitutes the basis for all the Hebrew traditions of the days before King Saul. Joseph, for example, is merely a Hebrew adaptation of the Egyptian god Osiris. Like Joseph Osiris is the "beloved son" of his father, of special beauty and rank. He too descends in order to arise anew. He suffers at the hands of his brother. Joseph is thrown into a cistern; Osiris into a floating chest; both reach Egypt. Osiris rules in a prison, namely, the kingdom of the dead. The story of Potiphar's wife has its counterpart in Egyptian tales. The account of Moses' brazen serpent in the wilderness grows out of the worship in Heroopolis of the serpent-headed god Tum and out of the Egyptian custom of setting the sacred animals upon a pole. The march around the walls of Jerico is simply the Hebrew version of the ancient jubilee celebration in the worship of the Egyptian gods, which consisted of festive processions around

their temples. These parallels that Völter traces between Egypt and Israel are said by Egyptologists to be without any real inner connections. Bodies of tradition which happen to manifest similarities and analogies at some points cannot for that reason be regarded as essentially related, as a study of Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie* and his explanations of *Mythos und Religion* would have shown. The kernel of truth that may be hidden in Völter's representations is lost in the mass of his exaggerations.

Along this same line a Catholic scholar Mader in an interesting investigation concerning the origin of human sacrifice among the ancient Hebrews (*Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer und der benachbarten Völker*) comes to the conclusion that the Israelitish worship of Moloch is of Egyptian origin. His argument is not convincing but it is one of the indications of the present trend. In this connection mention should also be made of a work by A. Alt, *Israel und Aegypten,* in which the author very ably discusses the political relation between the Pharaohs and the kings of Israel and Judah in three periods: Sheshonk and Solomon, Assyrians and Ethiopians, Necho and Nebuchadnezzar.

The other theory of Hebrew origins, Pan-Babylonism, continues to hold the center of interest in the study of comparative religions as applied to the Old Testament, and the literature on the subject bulks large. The sensational element in the proposition with which Delitzsch startled the theological world in 1902 has passed. The slogan "Babel-Bibel" has died away into silence. But the scholarly world was quick to perceive that a real problem was involved, and this has given direction to the investigations of many learned scholars from that day to this. Their number is ever increasing and many views that a few years ago were the subjects of heated controversy have to-day become common property of scientific thought. Many theologians, among them the most conservative, are ready to admit a real cultural influence of Babylon upon Israel in writing and industry, in customs and laws, in cosmology, forms of worship, and eschatological hopes. Their only concern now is to ascertain the degree of the influence, to prevent exaggerations and unwarranted assumptions, and above all to establish the distinctive peculiarity and admitted superiority of Israel in matters religious. The work has now advanced sufficiently to justify a review of achievements, and not a few efforts have been made recently to add up

the gains and losses and strike a balance. Of these we may mention the following: Köberle, *Die Beziehungen zwischen Israel und Babylon,* 1908 (posthumous, specially adapted to orientate on this question); Wilke, *Die astralmythologische Weltanschauung und das Alte Testament* (against Winckler); A. Jerimias, *Der Einfluss Babyloniens auf das Verständnis des Alten Testaments* (emphasizing that influence); R. Kittel, *Die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft in ihren wichtigsten Ergebnissen,* 1910 (positive, concise, clear, impartial, judicious); Erbt, *Handbuch zum Alten Testament* (advocating the Pan-Babylonism of Winckler, intended for teachers); Sellin, *Die alttestamentliche Religion im Rahmen der anderen altorientalischen;* König, *Geschichte des Reiches Gottes.*

In a series of four articles in the current volume of the *Neue Kirchle Zeitschrift,* Ed. König gives a brief but comprehensive statement of the facts that he believes to have been established in the course of the recent investigations on this entire subject of the relation between Babylon and the Old Testament. The series is called *Babylonische Kultur und alttestamentliche Ideenwelt*...In the first article he recounts the points of contact or of similarity that must be admitted to have existed between the civilization of Babylon and that of Israel. He makes the preliminary point however that in spite of any influence that may have been exerted by Babylon upon Israel there may have been particular individuals and branches of families that resisted all foreign influence (e. g. the Rechabites) and that Israel or at least her leading spirits may have maintained throughout her history certain cultural principles as the distinguishing characteristics of their nation.

Among the unquestionable elements of correspondence he mentions first that of language. Similarities in sound and sense of words and even in idioms are easily discernable and König claims to have traced them in detail in his new (1910) Hebrew-Aramaic lexicon (a book which has been very favorably criticised). The poetries of the two peoples also show interesting correspondences in parallelisms, in text and rhythm, and in responsories. These similarities are explained on the ground that both Babylonians and Hebrews are Semites and closely related through Abraham.

Moreover in external conditions of civilization, as for example,

in the construction of canals and the building of arches, in weights, measures, and coins, in rites and ceremonies, and in all kinds of agricultural, astronomical, and mathematical achievements, the two peoples stood on about the same level. In ethical standards and moral practices close, but not exact, parallels are to be observed. Thus the institution of concubinage and the corresponding rights of inheritance are very similar in the account of Hagar (Gen. 16 and 21) and in the law of Hammurabi (Sec. 170), but not without essential points of difference.

In the sphere of religion, König admits that sooth-saying is mutual, but remarks that in Babylonia and Assyria sooth-saying is nearly always based upon the observation of omens, in Israel never. He also draws the important and original distinction that sooth-saying is an element of Israelitish civilization but by no means of Old Testament thought. But there are integral elements of religion, equally emphasized by both peoples. Such are the prayers to heaven for benefits, the altars to the deity, and the offering of sacrifices both of gratitude and of expiation. Concerning these König remarks: "These correspondences in matters of worship show that the Old Testament religion does not pretend in all its parts to rest upon direct divine revelation in the sense of disclosure. They are to be explained on the ground that God in constructing the form of worship pleasing to Himself permitted His agents in Israel to make use of certain elements of universal religion.....These correspondences are to be accounted for in part by the racial relationships existing between the two peoples,.... and in part by the law of parallel development of contemporaneous nations living under like geographical conditions. We can scarcely speak of direct borrowing."

In the other three articles König emphasizes the fundamental differences between Babel and Bible. And first as to language. Recent excavations in Palestine prove immense differences in vocabulary between the language of Canaan and that of Babylon (a fact entirely overlooked by Clay in his "Amurru"). Moreover, Abraham and the other Hebrews needed no interpreters in Canaan (e. g. Gen. 23), whereas the Assyrians are said to speak a language incomprehensible to the Israelites (Deut. 28:49). And nowhere is there the slightest intimation that the late Hebrews had to translate their older literature from the Babylonian

language. We note also important differences in the measures employed by the two peoples, the Hebrews employing the decimal system, the Babylonians the sexagesimal; in the time of beginning the year, the Hebrews in the Fall, the Babylonians in the Spring; in the names of the stars; and in the names of the months.

In the forms of worship also there are fundamental differences. The Babylonian divination of omens does not exist in the real "Israel of God" and the practice of sooth-saying is condemned wherever mentioned. The rite of circumcision existed, it is true, in Egypt but certainly not in Babylon. The same is true of the distinction between clean and unclean animals. The Babylonians in contrast with the Israelites did not limit themselves in their sacrifice to the products of herd and field but offered up honey and indeed products of all kinds. Babylon had its analogy to the Hebrew Sabbath, but with these essential differences: first, in the manner of its recurrence; second, in the fact that the Babylonian Sabbath was an evil day of fear when even offerings were forbidden; and third, in the fact that the Babylonian Sabbath was a day not for rest but for more business than the ordinary day. Then, too, the Babylonians made images of their gods and worshipped them, and that openly.

Above all in the sphere of religious faith the difference is vast and fundamental. It is nothing less than the sharp opposition of polytheism and monotheism. König here combats the thesis of Friederich Delitzsch that the monotheism of the Bible has come from Babel, and that of Alfred Jeremias that monotheistic tendencies are to be observed among the "wise" of Babylon. The history of Babylonian-Assyrian religion does indicate at times the practice of henotheism or monolatry but never of monotheism. Joshua 24:21 sqq. and many other passages clearly indicate that the religious consciousness of the Israelites centered about their monotheistic faith,—the conviction that the call of Abraham began a new era in the relationship between God and man.

The question of the relation between the primitive narratives in the Bible (Gen. 1-11) and similar stories in Babylonian lore is subjected to a lengthy review in the light of the most recent developments. Nearly twenty pages are devoted to a summation of the evidence in the case of the flood narrative. Large

emphasis is placed upon the significance of the Babylonian version most recently discovered by Hilprecht. It is considered the most authoritative and original of the four now known. Special attention is given to the latest utterances of Delitzsch and especially of Gunkel in the recent new edition of his commentary on Genesis. The conclusion in the whole matter is that there are really no good grounds for the wide-spread assumption that the Babylonian account was borrowed by the Israelites through the medium of the Canaanite civilization. Far better grounds are there for holding that those features of the account which are common to both the Babylonian and the Biblical narrative are the ancient heritage of the nations which once wandered over the face of western Asia. This common heritage was handed down from generation to generation among the Babylonians as well as the descendants of Abraham and underwent parallel courses of development among each people. And certainly the Biblical account represents the most ancient stage of the inner, spiritual, religious development of the human race.

Finally it is shown how utterly without foundation in fact is the contention of Winckler, Gunkel, Jeremias, *et al.*, that the histiography of the Old Testament has been formally and materially influenced by Babylonian mythology. Evidence is outlined to disprove the ingenious hypothesis that Abraham represents the moon-god, that the narrative of Moses is simply the Hebrew edition of the legend of King Sargon, that Joseph is the god Tammuz-Adonis or the goddess Astarte, and that the story of David embodies the myth of Marduk. Thus the independence and originality of the Old Testament historical narratives is maintained and their essential historicity and trust-worthiness is vindicated.

Bearing on this last point there has just appeared a small work by W. Lotz, *Abraham, Isaak, und Jakob,* 1910, (*Bibl. Zeit- und Streitfragen, V. 10*), in which the various theories as to the patriarchal narratives are critically reviewed and the historicity of the patriarchs is defended.

We do not pretend in the foregoing to have mentioned all of the important recent publications bearing on the Old Testament but only some of them, sufficient we hope to indicate the trend of current investigations.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY. OBERLIN, OHIO.

The Person of Christ: A Consideration of the Homiletic Value of the Biblical Views of the Nature of that Person, by Edward H. Merrell, D.D., LL.D., lately President, and Professor of Philosophy in Ripon College. Cloth, 12mo. Pp. 192. 90 cents net. Postpaid, $1.00.

The ripe fruit of theological and educational experience is given in these ten lectures of Dr. Merrell. The healthy criticism of over-liberal modern movements furnishes ethical and Biblical data for the confirmation of religious truth as taught by the Christian Church.

The Person of Christ is first treated in relation to the Godhead and the historical divine record; then follows the soteriological relation of the Person to the world's redemption and regeneration, the Kingdom, Evangelization, Retribution, and Endless Future.

The purview is clear and concise, along lines of accepted traditional positions. In lecture VI, which treats of regeneration, Dr. Merrell distinguishes between conversion and regeneration, but confuses their relation to the believing subject.

He states that regeneration is the result of co-operation of the believing recipient with God. But *palin genesis* is the sole act of God. Regeneration is a begetting, a birth, a creation. The man in sin is dead; rebirth comes from God.

Justification is an act solely of God *for* the believing subject; regeneration is an act solely of God *upon* the believing subject. The conditions which make regeneration possible are produced and charactered by precursory influences from God through illumination and prevenient divine acts of grace. *Energeia* precedes *sunergeia.*

God begins the work of saving grace and makes man spiritually alive, before man spiritually works, or co-operates.

In treating the subject of Retribution and Endless Future sufficient care is not taken in the use of the term *aionios,* and the character of punishment is quite lost in the chief stress placed upon everlastingness.

But the strength of the book is to be fully felt and recognized in the totality of its clear and forceful effect upon the reader. The themes have been for long thought over and effectively handled.

M. COOVER.

METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE. SHANGHI AND FOO CHOW, CHINA.

The Word For God in Chinese. By Rev. C. A. Stanley, D.D., American Board Missionary, Tientsin, China.

The translation of divine terms and of more or less technical religious terms, represents great difficulties to those upon whom the responsibility rests of giving God's Word to the nations of the earth. None present greater difficulties than the name of God. The above brochure of Dr. Stanley is in proof therof. No doubt the first missionaries followed what they conceived the proper plan when they used the most popular word for God in China. The same is true largely in India, where the word "Swami" in former times was largely used for the designation of Lord, although anybody was lord. Dr. Stanley rightly contends, and he has history on his side, that if possible the generic word for God in every nation should be the term used. But just here is where the difficulty arises and in nations which have a long history in religious development, it is difficult to determine which are the generic terms. It is sufficient to say Dr. Stanley thinks "Shen" is the word in Chinese and ought to be employed for God instead of "Shangti." But he has against him a pretty large concensus of opinion among scholars and missionaries, who have used "Shangti," and "Shen," the word he thinks ought to be used for God, is the word by which they translate "Spirit."

What makes the situation more critical in Chinese, is that the party which stands for unity is employing "Shangti," as above indicated. Their argument is that it matters not so much what term is used, only so there is general agreement. The word can be filled with the Christian idea and the more people who will use it so filled, the stronger will grow the conception of God. All terms in Chinese are inadequate to express the Hebrew and Christian conception of the term "God." India missionaries have passed through the same contention in regard to terminology. The contention now is, if possible, to get concensus of opinion among the various missionaries. Dr. Stanley puts up a strong argument for "Shen" as the proper word. If his contention be right it seems rather strange that the translators should urge "Shangti," when "Shen" is so manifestly the more appropriate word and the one that stands for the generic idea. One thing may be said however, that the party against whom he contends, seems more influential and much stronger than his party, and that unless he has every reasonable ground for hope that he can influence missionaries of the present time, he would very much better throw the weight of his energy into the effort of educating the Christian Church into the conception of God as revealed in God's Word, apart from the terms used, and this

because the terms for "God" in Hebrew, while all very significant, must all be taken together to give us the Bible conception of God. In India the storm has waged around the *unpronounceble* Hebrew term for "God," popularly pronounced "Jehovah." Remembering this unsettled contention we fully appreciate both Dr. Stanley's position and that of the Chinese missionaries who urge against him. If Dr. Stanley is right then evidently "Shen" will be equal to "Deva" in India—the "Shiner"—which is the commonest term found for "God" in all translations of the India vernaculars.

L. B. WOLF.

FUNK & WAGNALS COMPANY. NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Science of Poetry and the Philosophy of Language by Hudson Maxim. $2.50 net.

Mankind will be forever defining, reducing to its lowest atomic element whatever stuff the human hand lays hold of, fixing in its proper class each thing as it is found to be an entity. So determined is one to definitely locate and name that nothing misses his notice. Each star must be marked in its orbit; the return of the comets can be predicted; each atomic crumb must have its name. No distance alarms the confident astronomer; the microscope reveals the inscrutable infinitesimal. We must know every thing and give to everything its law. This is a universe governed by law, certain, unchangeable. Learn the law that governs any action and your eternal relation to that law is fixed. So the scientist, the philosopher, assures us that we may arrive at absolute certainty and fixity; every man with a sufficient knowledge of mathematics and chemistry and physics may become a prophet more believable than any ancient seer. There's no safe guessing any more. The wishing stone has been dissolved, analyzed. The brain is a congeries of atoms.

This passion for definition seems strange in a world confessedly infinite, immeasurable, indefinable. Eternity there and here, yet man claps together the doors of morning and evening and says, "Eternity is nothing, one day is all we have." Yet even the theologians have set the pace for defining and have dared to tell us what God is, as if the Almighty and Eternal could be measured with a yard stick.

Despite all this confidence in defining there is something elusive in this very alluring and fascinating universe. That's what makes it so interesting. Could we but know all we should be most miserable. Our happiness consists in following gleams, not in defining fireflies, finding them only bugs. Beacons of eternity are as interesting as eintag fliegen. Yesterday a professor wrote a volume on The Final Philosophy and to-day Her-

bert Spencer gave us his Synthetic Philosophy, which is now fit subject for the dusting cloth. So soon does one's definition need new defining.

Well, here in this volume, whose title stands yonder at the head of this review, a noted inventor of a machine gun that can hit the mark and of smokeless powder that can blow us all to kingdom come—Hudson Maxim—cocksure of many things, announces a definition of that most elusive thing, poetry—and a fixed principle of that most fluctuating thing—language. Has he forgotten that every man, each being a poet in the germ, has in him

"Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped."

But, no, he would define poetry and establish a law by which everyone may write or at least test a poem.

What is poetry? Carlyle asserts that it is "the most perfect speech of man, that in which he comes nearest to being able to utter the truth." But it's only, you see, Mr. Maxim, an approximation, not to be defined. Poetry laughs at your laws, sir. It belongs to infinity, to eternity. Do you remember those lines Lowell put into the mouth of Columbus?

"And I believed the poets; it is they
Who standing at the central truth
And listening to the inner flow of things
Speak to the world out of Eternity."

Yes, the poet is the mouthpiece of the Eternal.

Do you recall those lines from the proem of Bailey's Faustus?

"Poetry is itself a thing of God;
He made his prophets poets; and the more
We feel of poesie do we become
Like God in love and power—undermakers."

These are not included in the list of great poetic lines marshalled at the close of this pretentious volume. Nor indeed does one find here many, many more lines that have the eternal, indefinable quality of true poetry in them.

This great big book may make a stir in the world. But in the face of such an inventor of guns and powder I dare to say that this book will cause only harmless explosions like those one hears on the testing grounds when new guns and new powder are being tried, or on Independence Day when noise is regnant. One can hardly predict eternal fame for Mr. Maxim as a writer of this book. No, he will continue to be justly famous for guns and powder and such like, but literary criticism is not chemical analysis, nor the science of poetry like the science of explosives. We catch only at the form of this goddess; loving her with undying ardor, pursuing her with changeless loyalty, daring all for her smiles, we catch only the gleam of her matchless eyes, hear

the rustle of her swiftly flowing garments, but ever following her in the sure faith that in the far-off, eternal fields we shall at last come up with her and wreath of the fadeless flowers she plucks for us a garland of immortal youth.

D. W. WOODS.

COCHRANE PUBLISHING CO., TRIBUNE BUILDING, NEW YORK.

Logic and Imagination in the Perception of Truth. By J. Rush Stoner, M.A. Pp. 383.

There is a sub-title to this book, *The Nature of Pure Activity in two series. Book I and Book II.*

In the preface the author indicates both his purpose and his method in the preparation of this volume. As to his purpose, or motive he says:

"If this little book shall strengthen the belief in immortality, revive the faith of the Eternal Presence, suggest some good and faithful way of actualizing the teleological principle in life, restore the freshness of a withered hope, show the way in any degree to the establishment of a permanent rational faith, inspire some aspiring life with a little good-will and happiness of social relations in the Citadel of Peace, and encourage the strongly brave spirit of universal conquest under the commission of Truth to some worthy achievement in the realm of science, literature, or art—the author shall deem it a recompense."

As to his method, he says this: "The plan has been to take note of some of the scientific investigators and philosophers whose works have been epoch-making influences in the past; and probably the nearest approach to physical science is a sketch of the principle of motion that represents double parallelism, "X" radiation, balance and equilibrium of gravitating centers, equality and inequality in the distribution of energy, the corresponding curves described by the different centers in motion, and the influence of the mechanical and dynamical; since this seems to be suggestive of the relation of mechanism and teleology."

We have found it impossible to give sufficient time to the examination of the volume to give a critical estimate of the success with which the author has accomplished the task to which he has thus set himself. It has seemed to us, however, that his style is unnecessarily abstract and abstruse. If, as he says, the book "is an attempt to review some scientific and philosophic principles within the ordinary modes of research and the categories of the plain man's way of thinking," we fear that this same "plain man" would have great difficulty in following him, and would hardly be able to recognize his own "way of thinking" as it is here explained.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

The Development of Religion. A Study in Anthropology and Social Psychology. By Irving King, Ph.D., State University, Iowa. Cloth. Pp. xxiii, 371. Price $1.75 net.

This book is a labored attempt to prove that religion—false and true—is the product of evolution rather than of revelation. It is characterized by the vagueness of the new psychology. Indeed, to the average reader it has little more meaning than an effort to exclude the supernatural from the experience of men. The inquiry, which the author proposes to investigate, does not contemplate the relation of the supernatural to the human mind. He says, "In the science of religion, therefore, we do not need to discuss the question as to whether there may be a connection between the natural and the supernatural. There may be a connection, but the categories of experience are not capable of describing it."

Now right here is the weakness of the work and of practically all other books which profess to discuss the history or the development of religion from a purely psychological or naturalistic standpoint. The question of a connection between the supernatural and the natural must from the nature of the case, it seems to us, be a fundamental one in a discussion of religion. Until the fact and nature of such a contention be determined how is it possible to analyze the attitude and the experience of the mind? If our author frankly disavowed his disbelief in the supernatural, we might understand him; but he acknowledges that there *may be* a connection and yet that this connection must be ignored. He holds, with agnostics in general, that "the scientific examination of religion cannot, of course, deny the reality of supernatural elements in the various contents and processes of the religious consciousness. It simply holds that the relation of the one to the other is such as can not be described in phenomenal terms." That this is true is not at all evident, for there are thousands of intelligent people who profess to know God through experience.

As an illustration of the author's style and method we quote from the preface: "As regards the viewpoint it is, in a word, that the religious attitude has been *built up* through the overt activities which appear in primitive social groups, activities which were either spontaneous and playful or which appeared with reference to meeting various practical needs of the life-process; and that the development of emotional values has been mediated through the fact that these activities were in the main social."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Religions of Eastern Asia. By Horace Grant Underwood, D.D. Cloth. Pp. ix, 267, 5 1-4 x 8. Price $1.50 net.

This is the fourth series of lectures on "The Charles F. Deems Lectureship of Philosophy" in the New York University. Dr. Underwood is qualified to speak on his subject from the fact that he is a missionary in Korea, which may be said to be a "nation born in a day." He has a first-hand knowledge of present day facts in reference to oriental religions. He finds them all deficient in those elements of universality, truth and love which characterize Christianity as the absolute religion. As one reads again the descriptions of these vague, incomprehensible and unsatisfying religions, he blesses God for the simple and beautiful revelation which He has given of Himself in His Word and through His Son.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The Eisenach Gospel Selections, Made Ready for Pulpit Work. By R. C. H. Lenski, Vol. I, First of Advent to Trinity Sunday. Cloth. Pp. 664.

The author, in agreement with many others, holds that the "old gospel and epistle pericopes" are too fragmentary because the texts for sermons on Wednesdays and Fridays, which were necessary to complete the system, have been omitted. Hence, he has followed one of the later systems called "Eisenach," which, it is claimed, is more connected than the one generally used. The treatment which he gives is after the order of Nebe, whose work may be judged from the late Dr. E. J. Wolf's "Exposition of the Gospels."

The author has done his part well. The expositions are sound and the language simple. If, however, the defining part of the title "made ready for pulpit work" should lead an indolent pastor to expect ready-made sermons, he will be disappointed. The book supplies material in convenient form on which the preacher is to "work."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Lutheran Annual, 1911. Pp. 80. Price 10 cents

This annual contains the usual almanac and list of pastors, teachers, &c., of the Synodical Conference. In as much as it ignores all other Lutheran bodies its title is somewhat misleading.

We beg leave to acknowledge the reception of the photograph in a neat oval brass frame of the late Dr. C. F. W. Walther, the founder of the Missouri Synod, the centenary of whose birth will occur October 25th, 1911. This is apparently an excellent likeness of this noble man of God and will be welcomed by his friends and admirers.

Beiträge zur pracktischen Behandlung der Biblischen Geschichte. New Testament, von W. Wegner, Lehrer an der Ev.-luth. Immanuels-schule zu St. Charles, Mo. Seiten 298, 5 x 7, in Leinwand. Price $1.00.

These contributions to a practical treatment of N. T. themes impress us very favorably. They are intended for use in Parochial Schools as a manual for teachers and others. The book will be welcomed by all Christians into whose hands it shall fall. "Shut-in" saints will find here edifying and simple expositions of over seventy interesting events of the N. T.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO. NEW YORK.

World Missionary Conference, 1910, held at Edinburg, Scotland. Nine volumes. Size 5 x 7 1-2 inches.

These nine volumes, varying in number of pages from about 200 to nearly 600, contain a complete report of the proceedings and addresses of the greatest missionary convention ever held on this globe. It represented every land which has been reached by the gospel. It aroused universal interest and was attended by the most distinguished Protestant clergy and laity of the whole earth. It was a great missionary business meeting at which large and far reaching plans for the evangelization of the world were discussed by specialists from the home and the foreign field.

The first eight volumes embody the results of the study and the inquiries of as many commissions on the following subjects: 1. Carrying the Gospel to All the non-Christian World; 2. The Church in the Mission Field; 3. Education; 4. The Missionary Message; 5. The Preparation of Missionaries; 6. The Home Base of Missions; 7. Missions and Governments; 8. Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity. Each of these volumes has an index. The ninth volume contains the "History, Records and Addresses" of the Convention and a comprehensive index to the entire series.

Every possible phase of the problem of the conversion of the world is discussed. The wisdom and experience of the workers abroad and the secretaries and boards at home are collated and made available for study. It must follow that the whole vast

matter of missions will become more intelligible, and the stupendous task more possible to the faithful student of the facts here presented.

The nominal cost of these volumes puts them within reach of all ministers, none of whom should deny himself the profit of their early possession.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

The Song of Songs. By William A. Quayle. 50 pp. 7 3-4 x 3 in. Artistic paper binding. Price 35 cents net.

This is a running comment on the "Song of Solomon" written in the picturesque and striking style for which Bishop Quayle is justly famous. He treats it as a purely pastoral poem, and pronounces it "the sweetest pastoral poem of ancient literature."

One is tempted to quote, so as to give a taste of the delights which are in store for the reader of this charming booklet. But where all is so delightful it is difficult to decide what to quote or when to stop. Take this as an example: "This lord of the lute who went bareheaded in the star-rise to write this meadow song, was one who had camped many and many a night with nothing to cover him save the coverlet of the black-blue sky dotted with stars, and woke at the dawn with the dewdrops glistening at sunrise in his tangled hair. When he sings I feel the meadow scent and walk amidst the apple trees. He is not talking about nature. He is out with nature. He is not admiring; he is absorbing. Nothing stilted can you find in any line or sentiment. All is free as birds which fly whatsoever way they will."

The mechanical work, paper, type, arrangement, binding, everything, is exquisite, all done in the most artistic way, so as to make it a delight to the eye, and to a refined taste. Nothing could be found better suited to be used as a gift to a friend of refined and dainty taste.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Social Ministry. An Introduction to the Study and Practice of Social Science Edited for the Methodist Federation of Social Service by the Editorial Secretary, Harry F. Ward. Pp. viii, 318. Price, $1.00 net.

This volume is composed of twelve lectures, or addresses, by as many different men. Yet there is a unity of purpose running through the volume, determining the subjects discussed and the order in which the chapters are arranged. This purpose is stated thus in the preface—"The plan of the volume is to sketch in broad outline the historical basis of our social service move-

ment and the problems raised by the industrial organization of life, then to discuss some specific forms of social service by those whose lifework has been given to them."

Most of those who have contributed towards this volume are recognized as experts in their several departments, and in the subjects which they discuss. For example we have a chapter on "The Social Ministry of Jesus" by President Rall of the Iliff School of Theology, Denver; one on "The Social Activities of John Wesley," by President Little of Garrett Biblical Institute; one on "The Industrial Revolution" by Prof. George E. Vincent of the University of Chicago; one on "The Helpless in Industry," by Mary E. McDowell, Head Resident of the University of Chicago Settlement; one on "Constructive Philanthropy" by Edward T. Devine, Gen. Sec. of the Charity Organization Society of New York City; one on "The Needy Child," by Homer Folks, Secretary of the State Charities Aid Association of New York; another on "The City and the Kingdom," by Frank Mason North, Sec. of the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society. Such men can speak with authority and deserve an attentive hearing.

Each chapter is followed by a quite full "Bibliography," giving the books that have been consulted, or that may be used in a further study of the subject. This is a very commendable feature of the volume, and adds very much to its value. We can heartily commend this book to ministers and students, and to all who are interested in this line of work.

The mechanical work is well done as is usual with all the publications of this house.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Lesson Handbook, 1911. A concise commentary on the International Uniform Sunday School Lessons for the entire year. By Henry H. Meyer, Asst. Ed. of S. S. Publications of the M. E. Church, with an Introduction by John I. McFarland, Editor. Leather binding, 3 x 6. Pp. 176. Price 25 cents net.

This is an excellent pocket edition of comments on the Sunday School lessons. The explanations are simple and to the point. Each lesson has an historical introduction, the text in full, an explanation, a brief review of the salient facts of the lesson, and some questions "for future discussion."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

G. P. PUTNAM SONS. NEW YORK.

The Political Theories of Martin Luther. By Luther Hess Waring, Ph.D. Pp. vi, 293. Price $1.50 net.

This attractive volume is an interesting and important addi-

tion to our Luther literature, and that too along a line that is practically new. It is really much more than this. It is a broad and scholarly discussion, along general lines, of the subject of political science, as presented in the various chapter headings, such as *The Native Necessity and Origin of the State, The Sovereignty of the State, The Right of Reform and Revolution, The Objects of the State, The Functions of the State,* and *The Limits of the State.* Under each topic the various views that have prevailed are clearly stated, and the best authorities are quoted in support of each theory from Aristotle down to the present day, with copious reference in the foot notes to the writings of the authorities themselves.

But, of course, as the title suggests, the chief purpose of the author is to present Luther's views on these several topics, and this is done in a very full and satisfactory way. Not only are his views clearly stated by Dr. Waring, according to his understanding of them, but many copious quotations are given from Luther's own writings, so that the reader may be able to judge for himself as to the fairness of the representations made.

As one reads these page after page his wonder must grow constantly at the many-sidedness of the great Reformer, and at his wonderful grasp of these abstruse problems, and his marvellous sense and sanity. We have been long accustomed to look upon Martin Luther as a great theologian, a magnetic leader in ecclesiastical reforms, and a stalwart champion of civil and religious liberty. But here he appears in a new light, or at least in one not so familiar to the world, or even to Lutherans themselves, as a master in political science and statecraft, and as the first advocate of social, educational and political reforms, the meaning and the importance of which the world at large is just beginning to appreciate, and not a few of which are being put forth to-day as new inventions or doctrines.

Ex-President Roosevelt would probably be surprised, as would many of his friends and supporters, to find that most of his so-called "policies," such as the encouragement of domestic industries, the control of monopoliees in restraint of trade whether corporate or individual, the regulation of prices in the necessaries of life, the prevention of extortion, the suppression of gambling, &c., were all propounded and vigorously defended by this German monk," centuries ago. We have here also the call for an elaborate system of public schools, and a demand for compulsory education, &c.

But we must forbear. We heartily commend this volume to the reading and study of Lutherans especially, but also of all who are interested in the general subject of political science.

The first chapter is an *Historical Introduction,* and the second a discussion of *The Germany of Luther's Day,* both of which add greatly to the value of the book. Besides the numerous foot

notes on nearly every page, there is a very full "Bibliography" at the close of the volume and an admirable "index," both of which are valuable additions.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE ARDEN PRESS. NEW YORK.

Problems of Your Generation. Pp. 104. Price $1.00 postpaid.

This is a strange book. The author seems to be a "Daisy Dewey." Or, rather, we should say she is the transmitter. At least this is what the legend on the title page would seem to mean, "The author claims but to have been privileged to transmit the following chapters." It is claimed that the contents of the book are "a revelation," but from whom the revelation comes, or how it comes, is not made clear. The idea seems to be that it is a revelation from the spirits of those who once lived on the earth to those who are now living here to help them to seek and attain a higher soul-life. If this be the case we must say that until these spirits learn to use plainer terms, and to present their ideas in language more easily comprehensible by ordinary mortals, they might as well keep their "revelation" to themselves, so far as any good that it is likely to do is concerned.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

F. M. BARTON CO. CLEVELAND, OHIO.

National Perils and Hopes. By Wilbur F. Crafts, Ph.D. Pp. 152.

Dr. Crafts is widely known as one of the most active, fearless and successful reformers in the country. His specialties have been Sabbath observance and temperance. But there is no good cause, no movement which looks to social improvement, which does not have his sympathy.

This small volume has a sub-title which reads thus: "A Study Based on Current Statistics and the Observations of a Cheerful Reformer." It is made up of an address delivered before several reform associations last year, and now published, "with additions." It is a ringing indictment of the evils which curse society, and a no less ringing call to all good men and women to help to suppress them.

While there is no mincing of words in describing the evils of "the consumption of liquors, murders, divorces, lynchings, labor riots, municipal corruption, Sabbath desecration, impure shows, yellow journalism, brutal sports, judicial maladministration, graft and general lawlessness," there is no pessimism in the discussion. While the author sees clearly our "national perils," and wants to make all other good citizens see them, he also has

"hopes" of their supression, and he tries to present them with equal clearness and force. As he himself writes in the preface, "It takes the blackest black to paint faithfully the perils of the hour, and the whitest white to paint the hopes." Dr. Crafts uses both the black and white paint liberally.

It is a stirring book and deserves careful reading and study by all good citizens who are seeking the welfare of their community and of society.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE NEW ENGLAND NEWS CO. BOSTON.

World Corporation. By King Camp Gillette, Discoverer of the Principles and Inventor of the System of "World Corporation." 9 x 6 in., pp. 240. Price $1.00.

The author of this book thinks that he has found a cure for all the ills of society. It is what he calls "World Corporation," of which he is the inventor, or discoverer. He not only believes in the large corporations but he would encourage them to grow larger and larger, until his dream of "World Corporation" shall be realized. What this dream is is indicated by the following quotation from his "Declaration of Principles:" "I believe in the corporate acquisition and final ownership of all property and control of all industry by the people."

So sanguine is the author of the success of this scheme that he prophesies that within two years fifty billion of shares at one dollar each will be issued. As these are to be distributed among all nations, war will become impossible, disarmament will soon follow, and justice and plenty will everywhere abound.

Can it be that the author is serious in all this, and much more of the same kind, or do we simply have here a new "Utopia," or social and financial romance?

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

METROPOLITAN CHURCH ASSOCIATION. WAUKESHA, WIS.

Catacombs of Worldly Success, or History of Coarseller Dell. By F. M. Messenger. Pp. 235.

This book is well named. It is a succession of horrors. It reminds one of the "chambers of imagery" shown to the prophet Ezekiel in Jerusalem.

The writer may be sincere, and his story may be founded on facts, as he claims. But we doubt the wisdom, or the benefit, of dragging all the decaying flesh and mouldy skeletons out of our social "catacombs" and parading them before the public. As the book is but little more attractive in its literary form and mechanical make-up, than in its contents, it is not likely to have many readers.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1911.

ARTICLE I.

A WORLD CONFERENCE ON QUESTIONS OF FAITH AND ORDER.

BY GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER, ESQ.

It would be difficult to deny that serious division between groups of disciples is out of harmony with Our Lord's ideal. "That they all may be one" was His prayer. Some may say, however, that the unity contemplated by Him was a purely spiritual unity and that anything approaching organic unity is nowadays nothing more than an academic dream. This objection is likely to be put forth by one whose conception of Christian opportunity and responsibility is limited by the boundaries of his own parish or local church. If he is aware of the vastness of the non-Christian world and of the comparative ineffectiveness of the impact of Christianity upon hostile forces at home he is almost certain to conclude that the absence of organic unity is the source of weakness. Unless and until disciples can together partake of the Lord's Supper, without doubt or scruple respecting the authority of the commission held by the minister who celebrates it, there will be no genuine and effective manifestation of unity.

When a man has reasoned all this out for himself he is perhaps a little chagrined to observe that his conclusion is plainly stated by Our Lord in the very prayer from which the above quotation is taken. Our Lord prayed that the disciples may be one *"that*

the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." It is a unity that bears witness before the world that is needed. Co-operation and federation help to make straight the path for unity but they cannot be a final substitute for it. As long as there are such differences as now divide the communions of Christendom, disciples cannot bear effective witness to the divinity of Our Lord. If Christianity has not the compelling power to unify His own disciples, it will fail to secure for Our Lord the allegiance of the non-Christian world. And His own words are our assurance that when oneness has been attained, the world will be ready to believe that He came forth from God.

When this conviction takes possesison of a man he begins to pray for unity as he has never prayed before. But, unless his prayer is purely mechanical, he will soon ask himself for a clear conception of the sense in which he is using the term. He will then distinguish three senses in which the word is used.

First, there is the popular meaning. Unity is to result from compromise. I am to take something that I believe and cast it overboard to lighten the Christian ship. Others are to do the same. In the end the ship will have a minimum of cargo and will easily ride the waves. But such a program is impossible. I cannot "compromise" a matter of belief. Either I believe it or I do not. If I do, to profess an abandonment of the tenet while still retaining it, is, (in plain language) to make myself a liar. If I do not believe it, the confession that I do not is not compromise but only truth-telling.

Then there is the unity that would result if all disciples were led by the Spirit to accept without modification the position of some existing communion.

Finally, there is the unity which would ensue if all disciples were comprehended in a greater communion than any that now exists—one in which all that is vital and enduring in the confession of each group of disciples should find place—one to which each group would make its definite and God-guided contribution.

We may discard the popular "unity by compromise" as unworthy the attention of thinking men. Whether unity by absorption or unity by inclusion is God's plan for His Church it may not be given to us to foresee. In one of these two ways we may be certain that it will come; and we may hold the opinion

that the latter of the two is the method which most closely accords with other workings of God's providence.

But if we pray for unity we must also work for it.

Now in order to work effectively in any cause there must be a definite object ahead of the worker. Otherwise he will struggle as one who beats the air. Why not work to bring about a conference between Our Lord's scattered disciples? This question was put to the General Convention of the Episcopal Church last autumn in the form of the following resolution proposed by the Rev. Dr. Manning, rector of Trinity Church, New York City:

"Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, That a Joint Committee, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, be appointed to take under advisement the promotion by this Church of a conference following the general method of the World Missionary Conference, to be participated in by representatives of all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior, for the consideration of questions pertaining to the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ, and that said committee, if it deem such a conference feasible, shall report to this Convention."

The Convention responded by adopting the resolution and appointing the committee. Subsequently the committee submitted the following report which, together with the resolutions appended to it, was unanimously adopted both by the House of Bishops and by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies:

"The Joint Committee to which was referred the following resolution offered in the House of Deputies by the Rev. W. T. Manning, D.D., of New York.

" 'Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, That a Joint Committee, consisting of seven Bishops, seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, be appointed to take under advisement the promotion by this Church of a conference following the general method of the World Missionary Conference, to be participated in by representatives of all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior, for the consideration of questions pertaining to the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ, and that said committee, if it deem such a conference feasible, shall report to this Convention.' have considered the same, and submit the following report, and

recommend the immediate consideration and passage of the resolution appended to the report.

"'Your committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe, further, that all Christian Communions are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and with singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow Christians, looking not only on our own things, but also on the things of others, convinced that our one hope of mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step toward unity.

"'With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency, which make for schism; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following resolution:

"'Whereas, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfillment of Our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one; that the world may believe that God has sent Him:

"'Resolved, The House of Bishops concurring, That a Joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, and seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, appointed by the President of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention.'"

The Commission was duly appointed and is ready and eager to confer with such similar commissions as shall be appointed by other Communions. Of course it is not proposed that the Conference shall be convened by the Episcopal Commission. Nor will other commissions be appointed because such action happens to have been taken by the Episcopal Church. Led by the same Spirit the members of each Communion will act of their own accord and in response to their own convictions that unity is Our Lord's purpose and that brotherly conference must precede unity. The Congregational Churches have appointed a committee. The Executive Commission of the World Alliance of Churches having the Presbyterian system has formally approved the idea. It is to be hoped that the Lutheran Church and the other great Communions of Christendom will be moved to act. When commissions or committees have been appointed, all of them can confer and such action can be taken as seems best respecting the time and place for the World Conference and respecting the method of preparing for it and the manner of its deliberation. The Edinburgh Conference has not merely made the proposed Conference possible by generating an atmosphere of brotherly love, but it has accumulated a wealth of experience in regard to the appointment and organization of preliminary commissions, the distribution to them of the work of preparation, and a thousand and one details which it would now be premature to discuss. Let us content ourselves now with earnest effort to unfold the vision of the World Conference to the eyes of all disciples. Let us, at the outset, avoid not merely the discussion of such details as time and place and method, but a number of other rocks on which it would be possible to wreck the great enterprise.

Thus we should steadfastly resist the discouragement of those who tell us that the task, if not hopeless, will be so slow of accomplishment that it is not worth while to begin. Let us answer that we are not going to work for ourselves but for Our Lord. The times are in His hands. The movement will be as slow or as fast as He pleases it to be. And for our own encouragement we may remind ourselves that many movements slow at first are fast at last—and that (all unknown to ourselves) we may to-day be at a much more advanced stage of the progress toward ultimate unity than any of us dream.

Let us also make bold answer to those who say that to confer about differences is to promote dissension While we cannot say that unity will quickly follow such discussion, *we may be sure that it will never come till such discussion has taken place.* Therefore conference is the next step. To pray and work for a conference is to put our minds into a receptive condition—to make them as nearly passive as possible under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We should be ready to act in conformity with the principle which we are fond of professing when we sing:

> " * * * I do not ask to see
> The distant scene: one step enough for me."

Conference is the next step. After conference it shall be as God wills.

Finally, let us avoid making up our minds *now* what the positions are which at the conference we shall feel bound to take. In the intervening years God's Spirit will be at work. Who shall say what may not be accomplished in those years in the way of bringing scattered disciples nearer to Our Lord—and nearer to each other as they are drawn closer to Him? Far be it from us to suggest the abandonment of standards or disloyalty to convictions. But where standards are opposed to one another and where convictions conflict both cannot be right but both may be wrong. The issue between them may safely be left to that informing Spirit Who, if we but suffer it, will surely guide us into all the Truth.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

THE EDINBURGH WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE.

BY L. B. WOLF, D.D.

The place at which the Conference met deserves more than passing notice.. Edinburgh is beautiful for situation,—a city set on a hill. Its castle, rich in story, towers above its chief business street, and art has made beautiful that which nature left bold and romantic. The city is noted historically as the center around which revolve the names of a queen, a preacher and a poet, who with other great men and women have made this northern capital famous. Mary Queen of Scots, John Knox and Walter Scott, names in the thought of every one, are ever green in the heart of the city. Scottish heroes there are in plenty, but none make for more real historic worth than these who have written the poetry, inspired the song and led the thought of a nation. As you wander through the old castle and palace of past kings and nobles, as you look down from the embattled walls, as you stand within the old church and cathedral or by the monuments of heroes, the whole life of a great and energetic people, passes in review before you, and you begin to see why it is the Scotchman loves and loves so strongly, his native hills and heather, and why he gave up his identity so reluctantly, even though in doing so he gave a king to and became part of, an Empire on which the sun never sets. His capital city is, without doubt, one of which every Scotchman may be most justly proud.

As a place for a great convention it could hardly be excelled. The choicest residences were hospitably open to the representatives of the churches from all lands. Its fine United Free Assembly Hall, and its Synod Hall, furnished almost ideal meeting places. The former is now the meeting place of the United Free Church, a union of the Free and the United Presbyterian Churches; the latter was the meeting place of the United Presbyterian Church before the union with the Free, and has since been sold to the Municipality of Edinburgh as a public building. Both

are well adapted for deliberative and devotional purposes, with committee rooms and all that adds so much to the comfort of a large assembly.

THE DELEGATES.

The delegates were chosen on the basis of the contributions made by each Missionary Society on the recommendation of the Mission Boards. Missionary representation was urged. There were about 1200 officially accredited delegates, appointed by about 160 Missionary Boards and Societies. Of these perhaps one-fourth were missionaries from the world's fields, while the remainder were officers, secretaries and members of the Boards and Missionary Societies from all parts of Protestantism, and friends of the great cause. These representd only Protestant Missions and under previous agreement were only allowed to review the work conducted in non-Christian lands. This was brought about by much diplomacy and considerable concession. "High Church" influence for the first time was united in this meeting and it was only by the exclusion as foreign missionary territory of all missions among the Greek and Roman Church that the "High Church" party of the Episcopalians was induced to join in the deliberations of the Conference. This enlarged the representation in one way, as to the extent of the field of representation, but also reduced the nominal representation of those churches which are carrying on a considerable work among the Greek and Roman Churches.

The representatives came from all lands. As some one said, "It was the nearest approach to a 'parliament of man' that history has seen." As so graphically put in a contemporary newspaper:—"Take a look at our fellow delegates. A sea of faces, old and young, middle-aged. The Continental delegates and the professional element are apparently partial to beards, but smooth faces predominate and it is a Caucasian assemblage, with here and there a copper-colored countenance. A touch of color is occasionally lent by a red fez, while an Oriental turban or a Chinese pig-tail and bright blue robes here and there, make a pleasing variation of our Western headgear."

EXPERTS.

But more important than their nationality is the character they bear and the cause they represent. They are a body of ex-

perts. They have studied the work in hand. They are here not so much to give and receive, as to record convictions, to lay down methods, to plan future work, and to lead the Church of Christ into a larger and clearer apprehension of the main mission of Christ's people.

They were representatives first and foremost of the Great Cause of Missions. It is doubtful whether any other consideration or purpose could have brought them together from such widely separated parts of Protestantism. High Church, Low Church, Broad Church, Episcopalians from both sides of the Atlantic, bishop, laymen, editors and professors from that body of believers who are wont to affect and appropriate to themselves the title, the Church, meet on a common platform, with representatives from the historic Lutheran Church from the Continent of Europe, Scandinavia, Denmark and Germany, and the world, with a feeble numercial representation from America. It seemed rather out of place to put the delegates from the Continent of Europe, largely Lutheran, down under the doubtful and somewhat undefined name Continental, and yet perhaps no more appropriate term presented itself. The more questionable it may seem to have been as we noted the insistence of the Anglican on his position in the Christian world. Had he been half open-minded to fact, he would have been less insistent in the matter of his Church's orders and ranks as he viewed his brethren from Scandinavia and Denmark, with their bishops and state church. The Lutheran name and all it stands for could not get that attention which the work, under the societies which bear the name, deserves, because of the divided state of the Church, nationally and governmentally. But in the matter in hand, the purely missionary side, the Lutheran Church, while less in evidence on the platform for linguistic reasons, the language of the Conference being English, claimed the first place as to missionary methods, linguistic achievements and devotion shown in every land.

REFORMED.

The Reformed bodies were fully represented, in fact, it is not too much to say, under the organization and circumstances, they furnished the dominating force, and while not aggressively, yet really ruled, gave character to and directed the deliberations

more than either the Lutheran or Anglican bodies. Their delegates were more numerous, both missionary and other, and the committees and whole planning and direction of the meeting lay largely in their hands. And while it was done well, masterly, and while the large representation due to larger contributions to Foreign Missions quite justified the prominent part taken by their delegates, it ought not for a moment be forgotten by them, that in world-movements, if they are to be real and influential, the historic position of the churches weighs quite as much as their aggressiveness and forwardness in Foreign Missions, and must be duly considered at every point of the progress toward that union or federation, so devoutly sought. An aggressive Congregational, Independent or Presbyterian body, accustomed "to do things" is apt to forget its rightful place in such a world-movement and assemblage. But the Reformed delegates were to the front, and whether Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist, the success attending the inauguration, carrying on and completion of planning in the great Conference, must be written down largely as due to them. They led. Anglicans were giving quietly their reasons for their presence, and Lutherans in their slow way felt it good to be there.

ANGLICANS.

Already the prominent part, taken by the Anglican, especially the "High Church" party, has been noted. This was due both to the character of the men and their positions in Church and State. The two Archbishops of York and Canterbury were present, and bishops like Drs. Gore and Moule and many others, could not sit in such an assemblage and be merely onlookers, especially, when great questions affecting historic-Christianity and Church federation or union, came up in any way for consideration. It was here they made themselves most heard and felt. As a missionaary wrote, "One would have thought that a third or a half of the delegates present, at least of the speaking ones belonged to their persuasion." But it must be admitted both the ability of the men and their great missionary work, gave the "dean, rector, canon, bishop and archbishop," a fair claim to the prominence they got on the platform. As an American Lutheran said, "They voiced more nearly the opinion of the Lu-

theran Church on the question of unity," than any other set of speakers.

PRESBYTERIANS.

As was natural the Presbyterian bodies were most prominent and largely represented on the platform and in the work of the Conference. When it came to the question of church unity they were much in evidence, but perhaps not more so than the Congregational bodies. All these see union in the near future, especially when they get on their feet to speak of how it is going with them. But more later, on this question.

BAPTISTS.

The great Baptists bodies do not get so prominent a place on such a platform because of their independency. Every man is for himself and they have no ecclesiastic headship and none to voice what in an official sense may be regarded as the attitude of the denomination. On missionary themes they are fully alive, but on questions of church organization, none can speak with any authority above another.

THE WESLEYANS AND METHODISTS.

These bodies were well represented, though the American contingent was considerably reduced because of the rule excluding work in Papal lands. It might have been in point to raise the question with the Methodists as well as Baptists, whether they ought not soon cease considering Lutheran lands foreign mission territory. But no Lutheran raised this question when the matter of church union was up. But notwithstanding the rule, the Wesleyan and Methodist bodies furnished a large delegation—nearly two hundred accredited delegates, thus showing a large missionary work. In the Conference they were not so influential. Did they but recognize it more fully, it seems that their natural place ecclesiastically would be back in the body from which they sprang. It may be that the Wesleyan, whose ecclesiastical inclinations seem more Presbyterial than Episcopal, governmentally, are more nearly ready for union with the Anglican,

than the American Methodist. But neither had much to say on the "burning" subject.

MISSIONARIES.

Such then, with a fair body of the missionary forces of all lands as they represent these denominations, were the men, and to a limited extent, the women, delegates that met to confer concerning the "greatest enterprise of this or any age." As Dr. Smith of China said, "There is no man living, no man ever has lived, and no man ever will live, who can comprehend this missionary problem,—the work of the Church in obedience to God's command to make disciples of all nations."

But to learn to know the task more fully, these twelve hundred accredited delegates of the mission boards and societies and a thousand or more representative men and women from the Protestant Churches of the world, met in Assembly Hall and Synod Hall, Edinburgh, June 18th-24th, to look the facts in the face, to examine past plans, and to make such provision for the future as a clearer knowledge and a fuller understanding of the problems involved will enable those to do who have been interested in the past and those who shall be interested in the future, in this great enterprise. As Dr. Mott so impressively declared at the close of the meetings: "If this (such a study and contemplation of the gigantic task) does not move us, what can the Living God do that will move us."

THE PLAN OF THE CONFERENCE.

The plan of the Conference was unique. It was unlike its great predecessors in London and New York in 1888 and 1900. It followed a model, more or less closely, furnished by the Decennial Conference in India in 1902, and by the Missionary Centennial Conference in China in 1907. The whole problem to be presented was divided up into eight parts and each part handed over to a Commission. This involved much preliminary work. But in this lies its value. In 1908 the International Committee met at Oxford and determined the scope of each Commission, appointed the men who were to gather the data for the reports and agreed on the method of procedure. In the nature

of the case, these eight Commissions somewhat overlapped, yet in the main they furnished a working basis which made the deliberations and findings of the Conference most dependable and helpful, in both fact and theory. For a year and a half these Commissions were working away with the aid of all the experienced workers on the field, to discover and arrange what could be learned on the questions submitted to them and through them to representative missionaries and friends of the Cause all over the world. Each Commission sent out a series of questions to from 50 to 100 persons, on the main lines of its investigation, and answers of greater or less length, from a sheet to enough to fill a book, were received on every possible phase of the matter in hand. Those best entitled to be heard, because of their knowledge and experience, were urged to turn over their valuable resources to the Commissions and these elaborate investigations were then classified, studied and presented in printed form in eight reports, varying from 100,000 to 150,000 words. These reports furnished the basis of the Conference discussions.

In addition to this a Business Committee appointed by the three Executive Committees of England, America and the Continent of Europe, suggested an outline each day to guide the discussions on the report under consideration.

All must admit the general excellence of such a method of gathering information. It sought out those best acquainted with the facts desired from the missionaries and specialists of the various boards, on every phase of the subject; it sent for the matter it wanted to those who could give it in definite questions; it sought to elicit information on every side of the complex and many-sided undertaking, and it succeeded in a most remarkable way in securing the facts sought, as the thousands of written pages testified.

COMMISSION'S WORK.

The next step was equally wise. These carefully gatherd individual opinions and facts were then compared, sifted and classified by the members of the Commissions, best or well-qualified for such a task; and where time permitted the members met to discuss the draft reports, and thus onesidedness and hasty conclusions were avoided.

It must not be supposed, however, that the reports as submitted to the accredited delegates from three weeks to a month in advance, were above criticism, either in matter or in form. Each one invited criticism. All interested were urged to send such in without delay and were invited with utter frankness and fearlessness to examine all conclusions reached, as well as the statement of facts made.

THE CONFERENCE AT WORK—JUNE 13-24.

It must not be supposed that such a Conference can be arranged for on short notice. To finance it, to provide for its entertainment, to engage the attention of the Christian Church, was a task the magnitude of which can hardly be conceived by those without. A monthly journal was issued by the British Executive Committee and the vast constituency was kept informed of the whole plan of the approaching meetings.

Voluntary subscriptions running into thousands of dollars were made to the funds, and a membership fee of $2.50 for accredited delegates and $3.00 for missionary and representative visiting delegates was charged, and thus, the financing was no great burden. The Executive Committee of the Continent and America, provided for their own expenses through voluntary subscriptions.

And now all is ready for the assemblage of delegates, and on the 13th of June every train into the Scottish capital bore delegates to the Conference.

At the civic welcome in the Royal Scottish Museum, the Lord Provost, the magistrates and town counsellors, and town clerk, all in robes of office, attended by the sword and mace and halberdiers, received the delegates and their hosts and hostesses, to the strains of the wierd bagpipe. Amid such enthusiasm, with heartfelt words of welcome from the Lord Provost, the Conference delegates felt that the good people of the city meant to make their stay one long to be remembered. Few more impressive scenes can be imagined than this meeting of welcome.

The work that made such a Conference run smoothly had largely to be anticipated and prearranged. The Business Committee presented a few simple rules of procedure. A permanent chairman, Dr. Mott, and a secretary, Mr. J. H. Oldham, and as-

sistants, were chosen at a preliminary business meeting, and the serious business of the Conference was commenced. A daily paper was issued and mailed to each delegate.

The Conference proper began in Assembly Hall under the presidency of Lord Balfour of Burleigh, whose first utterance was, "I am charged with a message from the King," which he proceeded to read as follows, "The King commands me to convey to you the expression of his deep interest in the World Missionary Conference, to be held in Edinburgh at this time. His Majesty views with gratification the fraternal co-operation of so many churches and societies in the United States, on the Continent of Europe, and in the British Empire in the work of disseminating the knowledge and principles of Christianity by Christian methods throughout the world. The King appreciates the supreme importance of this work in its bearing upon the cementing of international friendship, the cause of peace, and the well-being of mankind. His Majesty welcomes the prospect of this great representative gathering being held in one of the capitals of the United Kingdom, and expresses his earnest hope that the deliberations of the Conference may be guided by divine wisdom and may be a means of promoting unity among Christians and of furthering the high and beneficent ends which the Conference has in view."

The following Commissions were then taken up and a day was assigned to each one. The chairman of each committee was permitted an half hour in which to set forth the work and purpose of his commission.

I. Carrying the Gospel to all the non-Christian World.

II. The Native Church and its Workers.

III. Education in Relation to the Christianization of National Life.

IV. The Missionary Message in Relation to the non-Christian Religions.

V. The Preparation of Missionaries.

VI. The Home Base of Missions.

VII. Missions and Government.

VIII. Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity.

These subjects are not very exact in definition, but they cover well the whole scope of Foreign Missions. If they might be stated more in an order of natural sequence, they deal with three

main questions: (1) What is the Church called to do; (2) How best can she meet this call and (3) What success has attended her plans in the past, and what need is there for change in plan in the future to finish the great task.

The first commission in great detail set out the gigantic work to be done. The utter inadequacy of the forces, humanly speaking, was felt as a hasty review of the nations of the non-Christian world was made. Only a few statements may be cited to show the sweep of this restatement of the non-Christian world and its utter need. The commsision finds, in view of its extended study that "the present is the time of all times for the Church to undertake with quickened loyalty and sufficient forces to make Christ known to all the non-Christian World." The time is "opportune" as well as "critical." The Church of Christ is being tested and must come to a decision now, whether she will adequately and effectively discharge the mighty task, assume the blessed responsibility, and enter into her Divine Lord's plans for a universal conquest for the setting up of Christ's kingdom in the earth. The need for carrying on work with greater vigor in China, India, Japan and in all Mohammedan lands, to meet the peculiar conditions at present, is by no means second to greater advance demanded along the line of activity throughout the non-Christian world. The Commission believes that "in this twentieth century of Christian history, there should be no unoccupied fields." "The closed doors are few compared with the open doors unentered." The forces must not only be greatly increased, but the proper disposition must be made of them, both in the fields now best manned and in those inadequately supplied or not at all occupied. The methods employed should also be carefully studied and a deeper and more conscious appropriation of the spirit of God must control the foreign and indigenous body of workers in the field. The Church at home must be made to realize not only the greatness of the task and the inadequacy of her past and present efforts to accomplish it, but also the adequacy of her resources in men and means, and the certainty of her success and fulness of her blessing when she wholly follows Christ in carrying out his purpose for men. There was much saneness of expression in this statesmanlike view of the great field. While the immediacy of the demand on the Church was stressed, it was not regarded as a work to which mathematical

exactness can be applied. Little was made of the motto, "The Evangelization of the World in this Generation," and we believe wisely so. Among intelligent men and women who have faced the heathen world for 25 years, if ever so optimistic, and if forces of men and sinews of war were ever so abundant, opinions widely differ as to definite times and required forces of men or means to accomplish the task. Elements so many and complex enter into the task that all that can be predicted is that in God's time and in His way the work is bound to be brought to a victorious end.

But more essential than a mere knowledge of the vast territory and numercial host to be reached in the missionary propaganda, is a clear apprehension of the character of the work to be done. What must Christianity meet and overthrow with her message? From what must she lead the nations and into what? What in short is the mental and spiritual, the moral and religious possession of the vast host of humanity, yet unreached, in both the occupied and unoccupied fields of the non-Christian world?

Commissions III, IV, and VI take up these matters and deal with them under the heads: Education in Relation to the Christianization of the National Life; The Missionary Message in Relation to non-Christian Religions; and Missions and Government. These three Commissions cover the ground most thoroughly. Christian thought is pitted against heathen thought; Christian education is seen at work amid heathen surroundings; and Governments, whether Christian or heathen are regarded from the standpoint of the missionaries' work, helpful or otherwise, sympathetic or hostile.

Commission III faces the life of the nation as a whole. Missionary education has played a prominent part in almost every land, and perhaps no one agency has done so much to modify the national life or change the national character. It is evident that stress must be laid upon education as a missionary agency, just in proportion as the nation is forward or backward in intellectual culture. This condition will determine whether there shall be much emphasis on the lower or higher forms of educational work. In India, China, Japan, not only the more elementary, but also the university forms have from the first rightly demanded much attention. In Africa and among the lower orders of humanity,

elementary education has been sufficient in the beginning and only gradually the higher grades of work have been demanded.

The Commission rightly distinguishes between education as an evangelizing agency and as a necessary means for the due development of the Christian community. This is most sound. Failing here, the friends of missions have failed to appreciate the work of the educational missionary in such lands as India, where Christian education has become the "miner and sapper" in the Hindu and Mohammedan communities of the higher classes. If the Commission is anywhere open to criticism it is in its fear that the second duty of Christian education is in danger of being overwhelmed by the first, in the education of the Christian community.

To one acquainted with the working of the Christian Missionary School and College, there is little danger that the Christian community will not get due consideration.

The aims of Christian education are fourfold: (1) to influence all who come into touch with the school or college; (2) to train a Christian community for aggressive evangelistic work, (3) to permeate the nation as a whole with a thoroughly Christian spirit and with that natural result of education under Christian auspices, which will maintain the freedom of investigation, which is so contrary to heathen conceptions, and (4) to promote through education the welfare of the whole nation on the broadest philanthropic basis. All do not agree that the last named aim is legitimate, but it seems rather difficult to separate it from the third, for as the nation is permeated with the true leaven of the Gospel, it is claiming very little to say its general welfare is thereby materially, socially and morally advanced.

The questions are many as to the best methods to be employed. The Commission emphasized the maintenance of high standards, insisting on large central and influential colleges in the great nations of the East, adopting especially in India the elementary government educational system among the lower orders and cooperating with the government in all proper ways without yielding any Christian principles, and fostering by every possible means the work of female education, both in the nation and Christian community. Above all else the missionary aim in education must be paramount.

Commission IV handles the whole question of religion as held

by humanity apart from the Christian form therof. This brings home the real task of the missionary. He must not only reach two-thirds of the human family, but he must do it with their minds occupied by the errors, superstitions, idolatrous practices, as well as all that is good in the various forms of belief, that hold in subjection the human race. This is Christianity's real task: the condition of mind in heathendom she must face.

Animistic, Budhistic, Taoistic, Zoroastrian, Islamic, Hindu and whatever other form have had their vogue; and the message must be presented in such wise as to meet and dethrone their error from human life, and supplanting them, enthrone our Christian faith, hope and vision,—a mighty task. It is almost feeble to say that every missionary must know what it intends to displace and must have faith that the message will be all sufficient. He must not only know the repulsive, weak and degrading side of the religion with which he deals, but clearly see all its good points in a sympathetic way and show how all meet in his message, and how Christ came to fulfill all; and that the best of every other form of faith will not be realized till Christ enters into the mind and life.

Commission IV presents a fine review of the equipment which the missionary must have to do his work.

The missionary message is not one which he makes up, but one which God's Word furnishes. If Commission IV is weak anywhere, it is in its failure to emphasize the supremacy and finality of the message and the missionary's attitude toward it. It may be that this was taken for granted, yet it is well to remember that the message is supreme and ranks far above the messenger in force and power—"Sanctify them through thy truth."

The missionary, we are sure, feels the supremacy and finality of the message as divine and not human. As one puts it to the Commission, "I feel more strongly.....the absolute supremacy of Christianity as a religion." The missionaries feel the "supreme importance of the great central truth of Christianity." There is just a danger that in showing the points of contact between theoretic Hinduism, Mohammedanism or Budhism and Christianity, we may fail to emphasize the cardinal difference which makes Christianity such a necessity for the race and Christ's life and sacrifice absolutely humanity's ultimate hope and God's answer to the race's needs.

Commission VII sets forth the attitude which missions ought to maintain toward all governments, Christian or other. Doubtless the matter is quite different when missions must work in lands where the influence of those in authority is hostile. But it by no means follows that all is perfectly simple in other lands in which governments are only nominally Christian.

The work of the Commission rapidly surveys the existing relations between government and missionaries in the various mission fields and studies the problems of the missionaries and the indigenous churches as they come in contact with government. Civil authority must be reckoned on. Missionaries have their rights as have others who work in the lands of the East. Native governments and others must be made to see how large a part of a missionary's duty it is to maintain and help on law and order. Misunderstandings are bound to arise, not only between missionaries and governments, but more frequently between indigenous Christians and their governments. It is no easy task for a native ruler to maintain the rights of individuals when they run counter to the faith which he believes to be a part of the national fabric. And such a condition can easily be found in many lands.

The agency for the accomplishment of the missionary task may be stated roughly to be, the Missionary, the Convert, and the Home Church. This classification covers Commissions II and V and VI, the native church and the preparation of the missionary and the home base. On these commissions most valuable material has been collected. In all lands the number and intelligence, spirituality and ability of the indigenous church, have come more and more to be recognized and depended upon for a larger part of the work of evangelization yet to be accomplished. The II Commission is largely taken up with the questions of church government, the training and employment of workers on the field and the spiritual life of the believers and the thousand and one questions which are bound to arise as the Church grows and asserts herself in the presence of heathen institutions and life.

The problems that are stated are five in number. The *first* is the due development of the individual Christian and congregation. The *second* is the due development of whole communities in the wider sense. The *third* is the movement toward corporate unity on the foreign field among indigenous churches.

The *fourth* is the self-support of the Church, and the *fifth* the right adjustment of the mission and its proper co-operation with the nascent church. Each of these problems deserves profound consideration.

Space forbids more than a mention of them in this review. We may say that the fourth and fifth are the "burning" questions, and there is a wide difference of opinion among missionaries themselves on the field. The home church urges self-support and rightly. Yet the missionary finds it hard to grant autonomy even when self-support is nearly possible. There is general agreement that when self-support has fairly progressed and the Christian community begins to grasp the Christian spirit, cutting itself loose from its heathen environment, that self-government must take the place of missionary control. All missionaries practically agree that self-support and self-government are correlative. The view is, however, admitted by most, that self-government under wise guidance cannot begin too soon; and missionary control is best shown where it links itself with the indigenous church and teaches it how to develop.

The missionary and the native church must occupy right relations. The mission must limit its sphere. The native church must accept its responsibility and both must adjust themselves to changing conditions and enlargement. As the Church grows in strength, in ability to support herself, and in intelligence and spirituality, she must be given that authority without which she cannot be expected to reach her highest development. But all depends on the character of the growing Church and its release from heathenism and all that heathenism implies.

The tendency seems to be toward corporate union in the native Church. But the facts are not forthcoming yet to justify an early union among the simple people which constitute nine-tenths of the Christian community in such a field as India. We may willingly admit that it is no part of the program to perpetuate the divisions or a third of them, which mark our Protestant faith. But at the same time, Japanese, Indian and Chinese Christianity will be and ought to be more or less bound by the historic development of Christianity in her essential doctrinal position, and will be greatly influenced by the past experiments of ecclesiastical government.

Passing to the missionary, the V Commission covers most

thoroughly the ground of the sort of workers for whom the great East calls, and how to secure and train them. Most suggestive to boards and Churches, to schools and theological seminaries will be found this Commission's report. While it is true that every minister ought in spirit to be a missionary, it is equally true that "Saul and Barnabas" should be separated for special work, and have special training for it. This is more and more fully emphasized by all Boards and the reason is that the missionary body at the front calls for it. Special training schools at home or on the great fields are urging the necessity of this. The importance of language-study, the need for specialized training for lady missionaries, the requirements for specialists in educational and industrial work, the need of medical missionaries of the highest rank, and of trained nurses as well as the special training of all missionaries in the great subjects of their respective fields,—the religions of the great nations—all this is touched on. There is no need for ignorance to lift its head and ask to be sent to the work of missions on the ground that a call has been heard.

This is often dealt with too highly. The question of a vocation is more than is implied in the Commission's statement, "the real call must come from within." True it must, but the Church has a voice in the matter, and through her boards and organizations the call should more and more increasingly come to our young men and women who have the general training, and who are physically fit. This Commission's report will furnish a handbook for future candidates and help many a one to a decision, guide many a secretary in searching for missionaries and save many a one from mistakes in the matter.

The Commission on the Home Base deals with the question of the financial support of the work in the accomplishment of the task set. The keynote is struck at the opening of this report. "We have for our consideration the organization of boards and their auxiliaries, and the problems of bringing the whole of the home church to give to the cause of foreign missions a central place in its life and work."

Naturally the Commission on the preparation of the missionary and this one on the Home Base, cover in part the same ground. The candidate was considered and his preparation on the mission field. But the question how to foster the spirit of missions in the Church, is the great practical one, calling for an-

swer in every part of Protestantism. The Church—all the Church and every member of it—ought to be enlisted. How, is the query? Commission VI answers: By promoting missionary intelligence, by missionary pastors, by the work of the Sunday School and missionary societies, by the visitations of missionaries, by missionary newspapers and journals, books of achievements, mission study classes, by institutions to teach missions, by theological chairs and professors, and by a thousand other ways.

The financial end is solved when every member of the Church is an intelligent giver, which will be brought about just so far and so fast as the task is intelligently studied. The Commission also reviews the relation of the boards to Women's Missionary Societies and committees, and also the many administration problems which boards must face, such as furloughs and the whole relationship of the missionary body to the board. Deficits and debts furnish a most readable chapter, and the late Laymen's Movement comes in for favorable consideration as perhaps the possible agency to solve the financial problems of missions. Mission boards and their problems are laid before the Church as never before, and these ought in the future receive a larger and more sympathetic hearing for their great work which lies so near to the heart of evangelical Christianity.

The last Commission was on the subject of "Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity." Already considerable has been said concerning this. Naturally there is great diversity of opinion due to training and church relation. The Commission expressed itself in general as committed to co-operation in work and inclined to unity in work as far as practicable under present conditions.

It is necessary to distinguish between co-operation, comity and unity, and there are widely divergent opinions prevalent. All agree that Christian work calls for comity to the fullest extent, for co-operation, where practical agreement between ecclesiastical bodies exists both in organization and doctrine, and for the promotion of unity, where loyalty to conviction in faith permits. Workers in the home and in the foreign field ought in all things magnify those things in which they agree and minimize those in which they differ, where loyalty to the truth and their understanding of it are not endangered. The work of the Commission

developed the situation that the foreign workers are much closer together than those at home, that in comity, co-operation of effort and unity, they have led the way, that interdenominational relations have advanced greatly on the foreign field and presented often such a situation for the home churches as to embarrass them in their antagonism to each other.

In co-operation much has been done. In federation among those of a common name rapid advance has been made. Organic union is rapidly taking place among bodies with the same ecclesiastical government and the same or similar doctrinal systems. In the great mission fields—Japan, China and India—we read of the adoption of a creed of the united churches of the Reformed bodies. There is a Synod of the South Indian United Church, in which Congregational, Independent and Presbyterian bodies have combined, and a doctrinal basis arrived at. The union thus affected is tentative and waits for a larger union with other bodies. Among Anglicans the whole subject of comity, co-operation and union moves to a solution more slowly. Among Lutherans there is a movement toward a better understanding of the widely separated bodies, due to nationality; and in India eleven missionary bodies from the American and European Churches have united in an All-Indian Lutheran Conference. Considerable co-operation in education and training has also resulted within the same language area.

On the question of comity the Commission is outspoken. "It is the unanimous duty of all missionary workers and organizations to observe to the utmost degree possible the principles of comity and Christian courtesy." Undoubtedly such efforts and observance will lead to larger co-operation and closer ultimate unity.

On the subject of federation two points of view prevailed. Some hold that there are essential aspects of the truth on which we differ and that therefore we are kept apart; others hold that while this is true, the things which separate us are as nothing compared with those which separate us from all those who have not confessed the truth as in Christ. A way must be found to bridge over these differences. Federation furnishes such a way in the judgment of some, by which each body of believers "retains full liberty to hold and practice their own system of doctrine and polity, but in which each would recognize the ministry,

ordinances and discipline of the others and members might be freely transferred from the one to the other."

Complete uniformity is an unattainable ideal. But is it possible "to recognize the essential unity" underlying our differences. The body of believers in the mission field will accept the truth and adopt a polity of government, most in harmony with their environment. But the complete development of Western Christian thought and doctrine, being what it is, it would seem a pity to transmit to the East anything less than the richest and fullest interpretation of Christianity in its true historical setting. In doctrine and polity there is abundant room for difference of opinion, and as we magnify this difference, will we fall in with such a view of federation as here outlined. Much has been accomplished in comity; considerable has been done in co-operation, and both will help on the better understanding of each other and the larger union sought among believers in the home and foreign fields.

The question with which such a review ought to close is a very natural one, what may be expected as a resultant from so much? In considering such a hasty review, it may be well to give the estimate of others and let each one draw his own conclusion as to what may be confidently expected as a legitimate fruit of a conference, so great in purpose, representation, organization and management, and in promise and possibilities. But before referring to these opinions, we should not forget that the Conference determined, through a Continuation Committee of 35 representatives from the leading Protestant denominations and principal countries of the world, to carry on its work by endeavoring to co-ordinate missionary work, by pursuing still further the work of investigation and planning for another Conference in 1920, by promoting friendly relations between missionaries, by pressing for closer co-operation and intercourse, by urging the formation of an interdenominational and international committee, and by suggesting special committees, and by doing all other things needed for the fulfillment of this comprehensive aim on the basis of the Commission's report.

As it was frequently stated, the dominant note of the Conference was the desire for more unity and closer co-operation among all Protestant denominations. But we cannot forget that even federation and co-operation have their dangers. The truth

may be held so indifferently that men may be willing for the sake of unity to sacrifice essential convictions and historical positions. And now let us attend to some utterances of editors and others on the effect of the Conference, or their expectations respecting it.

The Congregationalist and Christian World says: "Tested by the dollar sign the support of missions proves the reality of faith both at home and abroad." "The Conference brings to the front difficult problems.....which grow out of our divided family." "It is significant, therefore, that foreign missionaries have led in the movement for drawing together the forces of Christianity." "The call of the Conference is first for co-ordination.....The work must be planned stragetically, not at haphazard or selfishly."

The Scotchman, the leading Edinburgh newspaper, in a leader said, "If to-day it would seem to many that Christianity is faced with problems at home that might well call for its greatest efforts, and by dangers that might make it fear for the future, yet it is only in accord with the lessons of history that this great Conference should assemble to deliberate, not regarding the difficulties at home, but regarding the question of how best and most speedily the ideal of Christianity can be made operative throughout the whole world. The day is past when men deemed it the right thing to sneer at missions, and designated missionaries, in the words of Sydney Smith, as 'little detachments of maniacs.' The interest which the World Missonary Conference has aroused is proof of the different atmosphere in which the enterprise of missions now presents itself to thoughtful minds." "Whatever other good this Conference will do, it has at least done this good, —it has given missions a place in the common consciousness of the common man such as they never had before."

The Mission Field, issued by the Dutch Reformed Church, says, "It evidently made a profound impression on the newspapers and general public of England and Scotland to see the High Church leaders sitting side by side with Presbyterians and Methodists, and hardly less so to see all varieties of Scottish Presbyterians in harmony. Things seemed decidedly mixed, when bishop and archbishop offered extemporaneous petitions, while a Quaker, called upon to lead devotions, did so in familiar words from the Book of Common Prayer."

"And the outcome?" asks Dr. Eugene Stock, Secretary, Church Missionary Society, "It should be assuredly more co-operation between the different missions and improved methods in various respects. But most of all, it should be a fresh awakening of real devotion on the part of the Church of Christ, throughout the world." "But the permanent value.....lies in the eight remarkable reports prepared with great labor by the eight Commissions on the basis of the correspondence from all parts of the world. Never before have such complete and well-balanced and really authentative statements on missionary problems appeared."

Lord Cecil gave his impressions in *The British Weekly,* in the following striking sentence, "The impression the Conference made on me and I think on everybody else, was the marvellous desire for unity and the wonderful measure of tolerance which pervaded the assembly; the 'Mirfield Monk' and the 'Ulster Orangeman,' like the proverbial lion and lamb, lay down together."

The Rev. Cyril Bickersteth, the "Mirfield Monk" referred to above, said in the same columns, "Clearly the one thought uppermost in all hearts was the sense of the grievous loss involved in our unhappy divisions. This was expressed in the sonorous platitudes of Mr. Bryan, and in the more pathetic utterances of Indian and Chinese Christians, who assured us that their countrymen had no use for our denominational distinctions. One was growing a little weary of this reiteration of the obvious when Bishop Brent and others reminded us of the deeper questions which lie behind."

Dr. Stewart of the United Presbyterian Mission of India, says some excellent words on the theological trend, "Dr. Gore, the Bishop of Birmingham, noted the phenomenon of drift in Protestant Christendom as one which no person could reasonably deny; and all felt that what he said was true. Not only were his own people changing but others also. The same essentials were not insisted upon as those which were prominent years ago. Old doctrines were passing out of sight or dressed up in different colors. New phases of thought were to-day taking their place. Ideas and ways, considered secondary in past generations, were put into the foreground and made to stand out as worthy of special attention. The appearance of Christianity as she faced

present-day questions and present-day duties, was different from that which she had shown in the first, or the second Scottish reformation, or even fifty years ago. The tide was surging forward; the sea was broadening."

On Christian unity he sums up the argument of the Conference in a simple and forceful statement as follows (and he writes as a foreign missionary): "Some think, and I am one of them, that insistence upon more co-operation has been, and is, greatly over-strained, and that sentiment in a great many cases has taken the place of practical common sense." "That co-operation is a good thing, it may be said, and should be adopted when all parties are alike benefitted and no sacrifice of principle is involved."

The Journal and Messenger says, "It was a great Conference, that held in Edinburgh, no doubt of it. The world had never seen the like before; it may never see the like again, though another similar meeting is planned for. Europe and Asia, America, Africa and the islands of the sea were there. The Lord Christ was honored, and large plans for the furtherance of his kingdom were presented and adopted. Men of mark were in the front and in the rear. They represented all shades of Christian thought, though for the most part evangelical. The one idea, above all others, kept constantly to the front, was the winning of the world to Christ. All this was good, very good. But a good deal of time and breath were spent by the speakers in telling each other how much they were alike, and how little is the separation between them; and this, though many of them knew very well that they did not propose to ignore that difference, nor take a single step toward removing the land-marks. Baptists and Presbyterians, and Methodists, and Lutherans, and Churchmen, and Congregationalist all talked about 'union.' It was the one word which sounded out more loud and clear than any other one word. Almost every speaker had to spend some time telling about it, and expressing his devout gratitude that it was being rapidly accomplished. And yet no one of them proposed to haul down the banner under which he had been working and achieving. All came home to continue their work with the denominations to which they belonged before they went to Edinburgh. And the next meeting of the kind will find them in the same position,

talking in the same strain, and still adhering to the same faith and practice."

The Church Missionary Review, the organ of the Church Missionary Society, gives two articles to impressions, in which the writer was deeply stirred by the "business-like" methods of the Conference. In a note of criticism on the evening lectures he says "that all those speeches have been alike in their tone..... and it is a cause for some regret that they were not either more devotional or more readily open to some indication that we do not all believe all we are told or accept all the advice we get." The same writer reserves "a word of hearty appreciation for the devotional half hour," each day a half hour spent "in meditation, confession, intercession and thanksgiving chiefly in silence, the leader's voice alone being heard." We may say that this method of devotion, from the standpoint of some of us, was not the best.

In "Further Impressions" in a later issue of the *Review,* he wrote, "The Conference abundantly justified itself" and "to be present was a great privilege as well as a great responsibility," nor "should there be lacking abiding results." He continues, "it groups itself around three central ideas; the broad problem to be solved, the best scientific method to solve it, and the possibilities of co-operation and union in world evangelization." "As in the dedication so in the intercessions the devotional periods, toward the end of the Conference, were soul-stirring. It was easy to recognize the life-long affection that rang in the voices all around as we sang the quaint metrical versions, some of the Psalms or 'Ein Feste Burg.'"

Certain it is that the results in the home church will be (1) the quickening of its missionary interest, (2) the better understanding on the part of the Boards and Secretaries of the problems involved, (3) a wise and earnest endeavor to emphasize coordination and eliminate competition more and more on the foreign field, (4) a sane enthusiasm, coupled with a deep devotion on the human side and a supreme faith and an earnest hope that the work will be done in God's time, (5) a longing to fill every place in the great field with a more efficient and adequate force of workers, and (6) a certainty of victory for Christ and His kingdom—this and more like this must be the fruit of such a Conference. The venerable Dr. Chatterjee of India voices in

a word his impression, when he says, "The most hopeful result of the World Conference lies in the *heart-union* among all Protestant denominations." He might have added that this *heart-union* resulted from a Common Service for our Common Lord.

Baltimore, Md.

ARTICLE III.

MAN'S RELATION TO GOD.

BY PROFESSOR J. M. HANTZ.

"God's creation of man," says a pious and deep-thinking philosopher, "was a Theomorphism (in the likeness of God) therefore man's conception of God must needs be Anthropomorphism" (in the likeness of man). In these words, we have the protest of a great religious thinker, against a tendency which has been the characteristic and the bane of speculative philosophy almost from its origin down to its latest days, and which was never more conspicuous than at the time when and in the country where this protest was uttered—the tendency to strip the idea of God of those attributes through which and by which alone it is primarily made known to man; to regard God, not as a person, but as a principle, not as the beginning, but as the end of our knowledge, not as the object of belief, but as the conclusion of reasoning, not as a being immediately revealed to us by our religious instincts, but as a hypothesis required to account for phenomena; —in one word—the tendency, more or less, developed toward Pantheism. The author of this protest saw clearly that the existence of God is a fact made known to man before and independently of all speculation concerning His nature and attributes; that the impulse which leads men to pray is an innate and ineradicable instinct of human nature that God is made known to us as the Being to whom we pray long before we learn to think of Him as the Creator of the world or as the first and self-existent cause of things; that He is to us our Father who is in heaven, before He is the Maker of the heavens and the earth. He saw clearly that any system of philosophy which employs the name of God without reference to this primary and essential character, does in fact employ the name only, without the meaning of the name, and without the acknowledgment of any reality corresponding to that meaning. He saw that a belief which was the property of the whole human race could not be the result of speculations limited to a portion of that race; that man no more learns by reasoning to believe in a personal God than he learns

by reasoning to see and hear; that this belief, as it is not given by any system of philosophy, it is not within the power of any system of philosophy to take away; that reflections and investigations on this subject are admissible only on the condition that they retain and uphold the intuitive conviction which is before them and independent of them; just as the attempts to explain and account for the fact made known by our natural senses and consciousness are admissible only on the condition that they acknowledge and presuppose the reality of the fact themselves. Yet though this be true (and it is not true, and the indispensible condition of all further talk) yet the existence of the opposite tendency, and of the several modes in which it has manifested itself, must still be regarded as one of the most important and significant facts in the history of man,—a fact whose significance is thrown away if we content ourselves merely with rejecting the error without further asking what we may learn from the circumstances that such an error has existed and continues to exist with so great and so lasting an influence on men's minds. In almost every country and every age in which philosophical speculations on the divine nature have prevailed, in nations and minds of every variety of constitution and circumstances, among the dreaming mystics of the East, among the poetic imagination of Greece, among the severe and rigid thinkers of Northern Europe in ancient and in modern times among heathen and among Christian influences, we may mark this ever-recurring tendency to transform the idea of God from a personal being to an impersonal principle or law; to set aside the voice of the religious instincts in favor of what appeared to be the higher results of the speculative reason. It had not been merely a passing phase of man's earlier and less advanced cultivation, set aside and forgotten as a higher intelligence prevailed and a clearer knowledge of the truth was established, it has been a permanent feature repeating itself with some variety of form but with no real difference of substance to the latest time. The last words of its utterance in our days have been but the echo of those of its first; the God whom it professes to make known to us is not a person, but an idea.

It is not my intention in this article to enter upon any examination of the arguments which have been advanced in support of this great and general error, nor to state the counter-

arguments by which they may be assured. I propose to deal, not so much with its character as a theory as with its existence as a fact, and to inquire into the lesson that may be learned from that fact. However we may lament it, however much we may condemn it, the fact still remains unquestionable, that speculations of this character *have* displayed themselves wherever human reason has been active and inquiring, and in exact proportion to its activity and inquisitiveness; that they have had an influence and a charm for men of the most vigorous intellect and even of the most fervent piety; that they have grown with the growth and strengthened with the strength of man's intellectual cultivation in countries and times the most remote from each other and under influences the most opposite; that they have moulded themselves to unite with the most divine forms of thought and feeling, yet with every change of aspect presenting one result and that result one which the inborn instincts of man cry out against in every shape in which it comes before them, which the hearts, even of its own teachers, may be seen to contend against even while they submit to it. Can such an influence be accounted for, except on the supposition that there is some real conviction in human nature to which it appeals; that there is some germ of truth underlying the mass of error?

This supposition is further confirmed when we turn our attention to another tendency, not less conspicuous nor less widely spread than the former; or the tendency to regard the image of God in man as an exact type and model by which to judge of the divine nature and attributes in all their manifestations, a tendency which is not content with merely recognizing, in the instructive feelings of religion as a relation between man and God, an intimation conveyed by God Himself to the heart of man that there is an affinity, a sympathy, a community of nature between the Creating Spirit and that one of all His earthly creatures to whom alone He has given a spiritual nature capable of feeling that relation,—but which strives to penetrate beyond that fact and to understand how and why such a relation is possible, and what is the exact nature and degree of that affinity which it implies,—a tendency which creates anew, as it were, an image of God in the likeness of man, with the thought, and feelings, and will,—nay, sometimes even with the passions and desires and the bodily shape and members of humanity, endeavor-

ing to make the relation between the divine and the human more comprehensible by merging the divine in the human. Yet this tendency also, whatever may be the errors and extravagance into which at times it has fallen, is yet too common, too natural, too widely spread, too deeply seated in our nature, to be set aside as altogether delusive. Like its antagonist tendency this too must have its root and ground in some natural principle from which it emanates; and which, if it be a real and true principle of human nature, must be susceptible of an interpretation in which it shall not conflict with other true principles, must have a purpose and a duty for which it is lawfully available, however much that purpose may have been prevented in its actual development.

The antagonism between these two opposite tendencies meets us in connection with almost every doctrine of natural or revealed religion, in the form of two opposite extremes of speculation, each in its own way striving to lay hold on that which is given to us as a fact to be believed, and to mould it into the shape of a theory to be comprehended. If we are bidden by the voice of nature, as well as of revelation, to believe on one God, the Maker of heaven and earth, speculation is at once busy with her opposite theories to explain what this creation is and how it takes place; on the one side attempting, under various forms of representation, to depict the several phenomena of the world as modes of the divine existence, having merely an apparent reality of their own; or on the other, by the assumption of a previously existing matter independent of the Creator, likening the Divine Author of all things to a human workman, the fashioner of materials given to his hand. Or if the constitution of the world bears witness, in its various relations to the existence of intelligence and design in its maker, we are told on the one side that the whole conception of final causes is a fiction and a delusion; that we may not interpret the work of God according to the analogy of man; that to speak of design and purpose in God is to limit Him by the bounds of our feeble intelligence (our power, to suppose Him like man adapting means to ends and devising plans to overcome difficulties); or on the other hand we are told that the designs of the Creator must exhibit an exact correspondence to the products of man's invention, that we must uncover its traces in the relation of every part to its corresponding whole, and seek a purpose and an end, such as our own, in every phe-

nomenon of the visible world. Or if the omniscience of God is to be considered in its relation to the actions of men, we meet on the one side with a theroy which denies to man any power of independent action and refers all things to the divine causation; and, on the other, we are told that the divine foreknowledge must be subject to the same conditions as that of man and therefore cannot be extended to events purely contingent and undetermined. Or again if the moral nature of which we are conscious in ourselves, and the marks of benevolence in the world without us conspire to bear witness to the goodness of Him from whom they proceed, we are told by the philosophers of one school that the distinction between good and evil is due only to the inadequacy of our ideas; that all that exists is equally divine, and evil and imperfection are but appearances; or we hear from an opposite set of teachers that the divine goodness must in all cases act by governing the world as a good man would govern it, were he in God's place; and that if this assumption cannot be verified in all its details we are at liberty at once to reject the apparent exceptions, as things which explain them otherwise as we say, at least cannot have come from God.

If this be the case with regard to those doctrines of religion which in some degree are discernible by man's natural reason, it is not surprising that we should find the same tendencies displayed, with similar results, in relation to those divine mysteries which are made known by and rest upon the authority of Revelation. In various forms of heresy which, in earlier and in later times, have manifested themselves in relation to the divine mysteries of three Persons in one Godhead, and of two natures in one Christ; we may trace, in like manner, the influence of two opposite methods of speculation; one in the direction of Pantheism, which, commencing with the Gnostic and Sabellian theories and perpetuated in various shapes, down even to our own day, has perverted the revealed facts, and compelled them to take their place in a theory of emanation or relative manifestation, or necessary development of the one absolute Being; the other in the direction of empirical rationalism, which from the days of the Arian heresy downward, has denied the Catholic Faith because it asserts something concerning the personality of God of which it finds no counterpart in the personality of man. And when the field of controversy is transferred from the person to the

work of Christ, from His incarnation to His atonement, we may here also perceive in the teaching of Scripture and of the Church, a truth which holds a middle course between the opposite extremes of error, the extreme which, in various expositions of pantheistic philosophy, has labored perversely to explain the Christian doctrine by representing it as a necessary movement in the development of the divine nature; and the extreme of that rationalism which rejects the doctrine itself as incredible because it represents God as dealing with sin in a way different from that in which man deals with it.

In the foundation of each of these opposite systems, we may trace the presence of a partial truth to which their influence and attraction has been mainly owing. In the superstructure which has been built on that foundation we may trace the operation of a desire in human nature which the very perversion and one-sidedness of such systems contributes to gratify the desire to attain to knowledge in the place of belief; to advance from fact to theory, to possess not only a conviction of the truth but also a comprehension of how and why it is true. There is a truth in the conviction that man is unlike unto God; for "my thoughts are not your thoughts; neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." On both positions of this complex truth, taken together, rests the right view of man's religious relation to God; on the one portion or the other taken separately, rests the two opposite perversions. The latter extreme, commencing with the true conviction that man of all God's earthly creatures, is most like unto his Maker, as a person to a Person, as a spirit to a Spirit, capable of personal and spiritual communion with God, proceeds, upon this foundation, to erect the personal consciousness of man into the means of a theoretical comprehension of God"s nature and judgment of God's ways,—into a sole and sufficient criterion of all that is to be believed and all that is not to be believed concerning Him. The former extreme commencing with the true conviction that the finite and human image can only partially and imperfectly reveal the nature of the infinite and divine original, proceeds to the conclusion that what can be only imperfectly and uncertainly made known in this way must be more perfectly and certainly known in another way; and that by removing the imperfection and finiteness of the human likeness it may attain to a false knowledge of the divine archetype. Ac-

knowledging, and truly acknowledging, that God's thoughts are not as man's thoughts, it seeks, in this merely negative conviction of unlikeness, to discover the manifestation of a higher and more absolute truth.

In contradiction to both these extremes, we find the Scripture and the Church as following the Scripture, taking an intermediate course. The two truths are to be clearly and emphatically proclaimed, each as the vehicle of that religious teaching which properly belongs to it; each is equally taught as a fact to be believed, but no attempt is made to combine the two into a complete theory;—still less to evade the theological difficulty by sacrificing either to the other. "When the Scriptures," says Origen, "speaks of God as God, and as He is in Himself and do not connect His Providence with human things, they speak of Him as He is not like man, (as He is infinite in wisdom and power) .... When on the other hand, His Providence is exhibited in connection with human things it takes the mind and manner and speech of man, as we assume the language of children in talking to children." Man's knowledge of himself and of the spirit within him is appealed to as bearing witness to what he may know concerning God. Man's ignorance of what is beyond and above himself is appealed to as bearing witness to what he may not know. If God is made known to us as possessing the human attributes of understanding and knowledge, we are told also that His understanding is infinite and unsearchable, that His knowledge is too wonderful for man to attain it. If the ways and the thoughts of men are ascribed to Him, it is said also that as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are His ways higher than our ways, and His thoughts than our thoughts. If the passions and feelings which in man imply change and transitory states of mind are attributed to God, the attribution is qualified by language which requires us to understand these things otherwise than after the manner of men: "He is not a man that He should repent." "I am the Lord, I change not."

It is not unusual to hear men speak as if all that is mysterious and incomprehensible in the divine nature is only so in relation to earlier and less perfect states of knowledge, and has been cleared up for us by the revelation of God in Christ. The language of the unbelievers of a former generation who protested against all mysteries in Christianity, is not unfrequently heard

now from the mouths of believers,—language which seems to imply that Revelation can be no revelation at all, so long as that which it reveals remains in any way above the grasp of man's intellect; that the revelation of a mystery means not the making known as objects of belief things that are above intellectual comprehension, but the removal of the mysteriousness altogether and making the things of God clear to the understanding of man. Now, in reference to such language as this, it is important to observe in the first place, that some of the strongest declarations of Scripture concerning the mysteriousness of God and God's ways to us in this present life, are made by the apostles to whom Christ had been revealed, as well as by the holy men of old who received not the promises but saw them afar off. It is St. Paul to whom the Gospel was given not by man but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, and who was caught up to the third heaven and heard unspeakable words, who tells us that God's judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out; that we know in part and we prophesy in part; that we see through a glass darkly. It is St. John, the beloved disciple of Christ who, in declaring "that which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled of the Word of life," uses nevertheless the memorable words "Beloved now are we, the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is, and every man that hath this hope in Him, purifieth himself even as He is pure." And in the second place it shall be observed that it is this very revelation of God in Christ which has given to our religious belief some of its deepest mysteries, some of the very chief of those truths whose incomprehensibility has proved a stumbling-block to the inquiring reason. It is through this revelation that we know the mysteries of three persons in one God; it is through this revelation that we know the mystery of two natures in one Christ; it is through this revelation that we learn the death of all men in Adam, the life of all men in Christ; it is through this that we have learned that mysterious blending of severity and love which laid on the Redeemer the iniquities of a whole world; it is through this that we have been told of that mystery of spiritual birth, of which, like the wind that bloweth where it listeth, we cannot tell whence "it cometh or whither it goeth"; of that divine grace which worketh

in us, yet leaves us free to work of ourselves. If these difficulties have their analogies, as indeed they have, in natural religion and in the general course of God's providence,yet the effect of these analogies is not to remove the intellectual difficulty, but to strengthen the practical faith; not to tell us how and why God manifests Himself in such and such ways, but to direct us to one and the same stamp of divine authority in both; to bid us believe that God worketh now as He worketh hitherto; to point to the tokens of His presence and teaching in that which we understand not, no less than in that which we understand.

And yet it is most true that the revelation of God in Christ *has* given us a light and a guide in the midst of those intellectual difficulties which encumber our conceptions of the divine nature; though it leaves them still as difficulties. It has given us the best and most necessary answer to them; an answer which is practical, not speculative; not one which removes them, but one which enables us to believe in the midst of them. It has given us a clue to guide our footsteps aright amid the temptations of the will. It has dealt with our intellectual as it hath dealt with our moral nature; it has not made us mentally infallible, as it has not made us morally sinless; but it has given us a mental pattern to mould and direct our thoughts, as it has given us a moral pattern to guide and rule our actions. It has given us a stay and support to cling to in both kinds of our allotted trials; it has given us a promise and hope of a beter knowledge that shall be hereafter when that which is perfect is come and that which is in part shall be done away; as it has given us the promise of a moral life that shall be hereafter when sin and sorrow shall be no more. It has decided the contest between those two opposite tendencies which have led men's thoughts into two opposite extremes of error; it has decided it by telling us what to believe as God's truth notwithstanding them; by ranging the authority of God on the side of the religious instinct of man. To the Pantheist it virtually says, "You have erred in seeking for God afar off, when in truth He was very near you. You have erred in looking for His manifestation in the height and depth of the visible universe, when there was a better type and witness of Him in the still small voice of the personal spirit within." When God revealed Himself to man in His last and fullest revelation, He took not on Him the immensity of the material world. He

took not on Him that abstract existence in which the material and the ideal are merged in one. He took upon Him the seed of Abraham, and was made like unto His brethren; He took upon Him the form of a servant, and was formed in fashion of a man. And therefore it is that, when you would scale the height and dive into the depth of the universe to search out the Almighty unto perfection,—to you who are under the dominion of a law of knowledge, as to those of old who were under the dominion of a law of works, the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart who shall ascend into heaven (that is, to bring down Christ from above) or who shall descend into the deep, (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead). But what saith it? The word is nigh thee even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is the word of faith which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.

But while thus pleading in behalf of the instinct of humanity against that philosophy which would blot out the image of God in man, the same revelation has also a word of warning and counsel to address to that other philosophy which would exalt the human image into a counterpart and rule and measure of the divine Original. The union in one Christ of two natures, perfect God and perfect man, shows the distinctions and differences of the two, no less than their communion and likeness. There is communion; for the two are united in one person; there is a difference, for that union is not confusion. The finite is not a mere miniature of the infinite; as a cup of water drawn from an ocean, differing in magnitude only, and indistinguishable when united to the source from whence it came. If the attributes of perfect manhood, of the soul no less than of the body, were assumed by the Son of God when He was born into the world, as a new nature, distinct from that which existed before the worlds, we may learn surely, that man, even perfect man, differs from God in something more than that sinfulness which has marred the divine image in others and which existed not in Him; we may learn that the revelation of God in man is not a full manifestation of God in His infinity, but a partial manifestation of Him, through finite humanity to finite humanity, one in which, even now, we see through a glass darkly, in which, even to the sons of

God, it doth not yet appear what they shall be;—that in short it is not the reversal but the completion of God's earlier dealings with us, that "God who at sundry times and divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son." And may we not also learn from the example of Him, the only begotten Son of God, somewhat concerning the spirit in which the adopted sons of God should deal with things that seem strange and mysterious in the ways of their heavenly Father? One such mystery at least there is, and, that perhaps the greatest of all, in relation to which such a lesson is legibly written for our learning. That we, the sinful, should be redeemed by the suffering of the sinless One—how often has the reason of man, judging of God as if He were man, proclaiming loudly and confidently that such a thing cannot be, yet shall we say that such suffering is harder for our human nature to bear? Surely in that scene of agony, endured not for His sin but for ours, when His soul was exceedingly sorrowful even unto death, the words which He uttered stand recorded as a lesson for our faith in our trials; and that lesson is, not the outburst of moral indignation, not the restless questioning of doubt, not the bold defiance of unbelief; but the prayer, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt."

And may we not learn another lesson of a like kind from His deep reverence for the written word of God? When in this three-fold temptation, we see Him thrice repulsing the assault of the tempter with the words, "It is written"; when in answer to the captious question of unbelief, we read His appeal to the same testimony, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scripture." When in the solemn hour of His betrayal, we mark His submission to the same authority, "How then shall the Scripture be fulfilled, that thus it must be"; when after His resurrection, we see Him expounding to His disciples in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself, with the question, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things"?—may not we too learn to find in the authority thus sanctioned, a wisdom greater than our own, written for our learning, a strength greater than our own, vouchsafed for our support? Whatever lesson may be learned from His example concerning the dignity of that human nature in which God was revealed, this at least we do not learn,—that the revela-

tion of God in Christ annuls or supercedes the revelation of God in Scripture.

May we not also learn that in some, even of our intellectual difficulties, we may find prayer and trust in God a better safeguard than labor and thought? Revelation has met our intellectual, as it has met our moral trial, not by removing the temptation, but by giving us fresh aids against it. The natural man has religious instincts which draw him to a personal God, as he has his moral feelings which teach him to distinguish between right and wrong; but there are temptations of thought, as well as of practice, which tend to draw him away from the one as well as from the other. The old temptation retains its two-fold influence, on the intellect as well as the senses; it offers not only that which is "good for food and pleasant to the eye, but also that which is to be desired to make us wise." In both alike we need a new sanction and a higher authority to strengthen the precepts of natural religion, as well as those of natural morality. And in both alike the aid has been given in the same way, by means of a strength not our own, siding with the right and supporting it in its struggle against the wrong; by promises more sure and excellent, by judgments more certain and terrible; by precepts purer and more directly divine;—above all, by the exhibition of a perfect example, and by the promised light and aid of God's Holy Spirit. Yet in both alike, man's free will and responsibility are not taken away; he is still tempted to disbelieve, as he is still tempted to disobey; and it is in his own power to resist the temptation or to yield to it. In matters of right thinking, no less than in matters of right acting, the divine support is needed; we do not stand upright in the one by the strength of our own intellect, any more than in the other by the strength of our own will. And when, in the strength, as we deem it, of that intellect, we find our thoughts leading us away from that aid which God has granted us in His Word; when we find our minds working in antagonism to that mind which was in Christ and in those followers of Christ to whom He promised the Spirit of truth to guide them with all truth, and to whom that promise was openly and plainly fulfilled;—when we find ourselves rebelling where they submitted, speaking confidently when they were silently questioning where they worshipped, doubting what they believed, despising what they reverenced, may not this antagon-

ism suggest a fearful doubt whether the spirit that dwells in us be not at variance with the spirit that dwelt in them? When such a thought crosses our minds, it may well be that the tempter which we need to guide us aright is not eagerness of inquiry, but willingness to believe; not a searching here and there for grounds of doubt and an impatient demand for their solution, but a readiness to wait and trust that God in His own good time will turn these things to our profit and will make a way for us to see the truth, whether through them or notwithstanding them. "If we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it. Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities."

In that patience and hope, let us pray that God who did teach the hearts of His faithful people by the sending to them the light of His Holy Spirit, may grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in His holy comfort through the merits of Christ Jesus our Savior, who liveth and reigneth with Him in the unity of the same Spirit, one God world without end. Amen.

Alliance, Ohio.

ARTICLE IV.

BENEFITS AND SOLEMNITY OF CONFIRMATION.

BY REV. M. R. HAMSHER.

To the devout Roman Catholic, confirmation is more than a solemn rite. It is a sacrament. In the Catholic Church at Emmitsburg, Md., a few years ago, a group of students from Gettysburg were the witnesses of a remarkable service. One hundred and twenty-five children in white kneeled at the altar, while the bishop, making the sign of the chrism, and with the laying on of hands, administered the sacrament of confirmation. This inclusion of confirmation among the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church is due to a looser idea of a sacrament, and a less careful interpretation of the Scripture passages bearing upon the subject, than is to be found in the church of Luther. To the Reformer and his church, three things seem to be essential to the true sacrament:—the divine institution, the visible element and the invisible grace. Now it is true that the Roman Church gives practically the same verbal definition. Cardinal Gibbons says, "A sacrament is a visible sign, instituted by Christ, by which grace is conveyed to our souls." Confirmation is a sacrament, he would say, because it is a divinely instituted rite of the Church, conferring grace. With him, the grace is conferred by the mere laying on of hands, *ex opere operato.* With him, a single act or two of the apostles, in a transaction, purely local as to time and place, is taken as the Word of Christ, to be binding upon all people and all times. When Peter and John laid their hands upon the new converts to the Christian religion in Samaria, it was to give them the special gifts of the Spirit, such as the gift of tongues and the gift of prophesying, which seem to be phenomena peculiar to apostolic times. It is altogether likely that these converts of the evangelist, Philip, had already come into a fellowship with Christ and His Spirit. The laying on of hands was not intended to make Christians out of them, but to give them special gifts. Meyer states this as the true Protestant position. We do not regard confirmation as a sacrament, in the sense in which the Lord's Supper and Baptism are

sacraments, because we cannot find any institution of it by Christ, and because its purpose is not so universal and essential as the true sacrament's purpose.

Nor is the solemnity of the ceremony increased by insisting upon its apostolic origin. The emphasis the Episcopalian Church places upon this phase of confirmation is similar to the emphasis placed upon apostolic succession in the ministry through the rite of ordination. Aside from the resulting strengthening of the form to the neglect of the spirit, based as it is upon Scripture passages, questionably interpreted, the fact is that an unbroken line of succession has been shown to be impossible. One of the historians of our Church says, "During the Thirty Years' War confirmation fell into almost total neglect. The great majority of the Lutheran churches at and subsequent to the time of the Reformation, had no confirmation, even as an ecclesiastical rite. We owe this heritage to Spener and Pietism." (Richards). It is an impressive service, not because it is apostolic in its origin, but because it is apostolic in its spirit. It is a solemn rite not because of the presence of the bishop, but because of the presence of Christ, and because of the dedication of the youth of the Church to Him.

Confirmation is a solemn and beneficial service of the Church, because through it, the baptized children of the Church have the opportunity to come into Christian fellowship with other believers. While it is not a sacrament, it is worthy of more attention and greater respect than is usually given this ordinance of the Church. The churches which ignore it altogether, forget their greatest heritage, and their hope for the future,—the children, who ought to be kept in the covenant relation with Christ. There are at least three things which make confirmation a beneficial and solemn rite.

1. Confirmation is beneficial as a goal for catechization. Instruction of the youth of the Church in the doctrines which were assumed by the parents at the time of the baptism is more definite and vital with Confirmation Day in sight. Just as Commencement Day is a spur to greater proficiency in study, and a deeper interest in the course, on the part of the secular student, so Confirmation Day, properly used, may be an incentive to deeper interest in spiritual things. There are some children,

doubtless, who may secularize the work and the "Graduating Day," and put it on a par with the work of the common school,—merely so much of a task to be performed. But, if the children are filled with the thought that Confirmation Day is one of the few days to be remembered in their lives,—a day to be looked forward to, as the time for taking a step which the heart is increasingly anxious to take,—it will become the goal of a very thorough and interesting catechization.

An ideal method is to have the candidates for confirmation and these alone in a senior class of catechumens. Too often circumstances compel it to be otherwise. Children of parentage other than Lutheran, or a lack of time to grade the catechumens properly, or perhaps a group of boys so full of vitality and vim that they require a class of their own, for the best results,—all this, in the face of the ordinary pastor's limited time does not permit the theory to be carried out in practice in every case. But, if there cannot be a senior class, looking forward definitely to confirmation at a set time, the principle holds for all catechetical instruction,—viz: the young people of the catechetical class must have held before them the definite goal of public enrollment in the Church of Christ as followers of His. This is a prime benefit of confirmation.

The instruction in the Sunday School is good. The millions of children who are coming to learn the truths of God's Word in this foremost agency of the Church for their dissemination are living proof of its value and efficiency. The one weakness in the Sunday School, however, is the lack of definite aim. Here and there we may find a consecrated teacher, or even superintendent, who strives to have the young people in his care learn the truths of the Christian religion, with a view to their making a public acknowledgment of them; but this is the exception rather than the rule. The class of catechumens, under the care of the pastor supplies this deficiency of aim. Looking toward the day of public confirmation of the doctrines which he is seeking to teach from the Word of God, the pastor, all the while in sympathetic touch with the boys and girls, can lead them into a public confession of belief in Christ, because he has had the goal of confirmation before him. The instruction has been more thorough, and has aroused a greater interest on the part of the child. Here is a first benefit of the rite of confirmation.

2. Confirmation is beneficial as a means of profession of faith. There are some churches, even in our Lutheran faith, which observed Decision Day, when an appeal is made to the young people of the Sunday School, to stand for Christ. There doubtless are some good results. But when whole rows of very small children get upon their feet, under the power of the appeal to their feelings, not knowing the import of the step, there is as much evil done as good. There is none of us who would dare say that the only legitimate approach to a confession of faith is via. the catechetical class. We know of many instances, in which the lives of men have been changed from gross sin and entire indifference to the Church to lives of purity of aim and activity in service for Christ, without their so much as knowing the significance of a catechetical class or the meaning of confirmation. There may be even some children, who, under the influence of the preached Word, come to the pastor of their own accord, and insist upon being received into the Church. If, after an examination, the boy or girl gives evidence that he or she understands the meaning of redemption, and is sincere at heart, what pastor is there who would throw a stumbling-block in the way of the child's spiritual development, by insisting upon the completion of an outlined course of catechetical instruction, before such profession is made? Circumstances enter into the determination of the time and manner of professing belief in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now, while all this is true, confirmation has a peculiar value as a means of profession, because of the preliminary instruction. The young man who is confirmed, after such instruction, is confirmed, knowing what he is doing. He is not making the leap with his eyes closed. He is not coming before the congregation and before his God, because of the impulse of the moment, but because, after careful thought and consideration of what is involved, he wants to come. Confirmation time is or ought to be the time when the young person has come to a realization of the meaning of the great Christian doctrines. He has come to know for himself what sin is; what Christ means; how powerful an appeal to the higher life His religion makes. And he believes. Confirmation is the highest type of profession of belief, because it is an intelligent profession. And it is a most impressive pro-

fession, because of its relation to the congregation. Seated in the pews are the fathers and mothers who, in a like service, had carried those same boys and girls, now kneeling at the altar, to the same altar to dedicate them to God. Then it was they entered into the most solemn vows to train these children in lives of devotion to the Father and to instruct them in the Word of God. Many an anxious hour, many a longing has been theirs. Do you not think that this service of confirmation means more to them, than if they permitted their children to grow up like weeds and to come into the kingdom of God by chance?

Confirmation is a beneficial and helpful rite because of the opportunity it gives the young people, already in a covenant relationship with Christ, to make an intelligent public acknowledgment of Him, in the presence of their parents and others of the congregation.

3. In the third place confirmation is the most impressive when it looks toward the future character and service of the confirmant. What vow is more solemn than the vow taken in this service:—"I renounce the devil and all his works and ways, and I give myself unto Thee the Triune God Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in faith and obedience unto the end." What a misconception of the meaning of confirmation when mothers and fathers are over-anxious to have their children confirmed, and then permit them to fall away from attendance upon the services and the use of the means of grace! After confirmation, the God-expected way of life is a way of development and progress and not a way of stagnation. It is not the fault of confirmation that thousands of men and women who were confirmed in the churches of Germany, for example, now have no interest whatever in Christian work and life. It is the fault of a formal, *ex opere operato* conception of this most impressive rite. Confirmation is a spur, an inspiration, an incentive to growth in the higher life, if it is properly used and correctly understood.

Just as the professional man looks back to his Commencement Day, as a landmark which means much to him in his journey of life; just as the minister will never forget the moment, when, with the hands of holy men placed upon his head, he was ordained to the ministry of Christ, so the young man or young

woman, who has come to understand the Gospel message, will never forget this service of confirmation in which his or her life was dedicated to the God of a loved father and mother. It is a solemn and beneficial moment, in that it bears upon life and moulds and determines, in large part, the future character and service.

Pittsburg, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

INDIVIDUALISM.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES W. SUPER, D.D.

One of the most important, if not one of the most serious problems with which modern statecraft has to deal is to find a workable compromise between the conflicting claims of the conscious individual will and the supreme authority of the State. In theory the problem is one of long standing; in practice it is distinctly modern. The individual as a political or even as a social entity is essentially a latter-day product. The vast majority of mankind has been brought into the world and placed in an environment in which everything was fixed for them by tradition, by use and wont; where they were almost literally bound hand and foot and tongue, and where the entire mass of their fellowmen instinctively opposed every attempt to do anything that had not been done before. It is a commonplace to speak of man as a thinking being; and perhaps he is. But the range of his thoughts is so circumscribed; he is so timid when he finds them carrying him in the least degree beyond the well-beaten track of experience that we are constrained to acknowledge that he is far more a creature of habit than of thought. More than this: to follow use and wont is regarded by the average man as so essential to what he considers his personal and social welfare that any departure therefrom is conceived to be fraught with disaster. He will not put himself to the trouble to test the validity of his assumptions; he takes it for granted and resists change by the infliction of pains and penalties on innovators. It therefore requires no small courage on the part of an individual to think and act for himself independently of, but especially contrary to, the current opinion about him. How many men have forfeited their lives because those who were masters of their destiny persistently closed their eyes to palpable facts! It is a familiar maxim that none are so blind as those who will not see; and it is equally true that men have loved darkness rather than light, not always because their deeds were evil but because the mental labor needed to adjust themselves to new conditions seemed too great for the

benefits to be gained. Just as men who are transported from climatic or social conditions to which they are unaccustomed feel ill at ease, they are equally so when brought into a moral or intellectual sphere that is different from their original habitat. In Jewish history the most strongly marked character is Abraham. While it is not improbable that his career as recorded in the Bible contains some mythical elements, there is little doubt that it is true in the main. He discarded the religion of his ancestors and kindred although not his respect for them; became a convert to monotheism; separated himself from his polytheistic associations and remained true to his new found faith to the end of his days. When we recall how much their religion means to primitive peoples,—that it is a part of their very flesh and blood, and that to abandon it is to invite disaster of every kind, then only are we able to form some adequate conception of Abraham's strength of character.

Although Moses plays a much larger part and occupies a wider field in Hebrew history than the "Father of the Faithful," he is in a far greater measure the embodiment of national aspirations, and therefore less individualistic. In subsequent history the individualistic element is most strongly marked in the prophets beginning with Amos. All stand aloof from and in opposition to priestly domination. They represent the strong and persistent monotheistic conviction which always found expression when the popular fancy, for the time being, usually led by kings, moved in the direction of polytheism. Elijah, who probably lived earlier, was likewise a vigorous and self-assertive personality; but we have perhaps no record that is descended directly from his hand. It is doubtful if there is another Old Testament worthy who has so strongly impressed himself upon the traditions of the Eastern world. The number of places, especially mountains, in Greek lands that bear his name is almost legion. He occupies an important place in the religion of Mohammed; in the Talmud he is compared to Moses and placed along with him in the Jewish gallery of national heroes; while among the Persians he is reputed to have been the teacher of Zoroaster. To what extent the utterances and warnings of the early prophets were current among the people we have no means of knowing. It is probable that in most cases their vaticinations were communicated only to a small circle of friends and

sympathizers; they may not have been made public at all when it was especially dangerous to do so. While they therefore represent a distinct individualistic impulse they probably do not indicate so high a degree of courage as we of the present day are wont to believe. In this regard Elijah stands out in bold relief. Passing rapidly over the centuries, we find in the apostle Paul a very distinctly outlined and clearly marked individualistic type. Here again we meet with the positive antipathy to the priesthood as a conservative force that is so prominent in the career of Jesus. Paul was a person of unusually strong, perhaps even of captious independence. Not only was he unable to labor with those who were engaged in preaching the same Gospel and teaching the same doctrine, but he even refused the support of those for whom he had given up everything. After devoting the early part of his life to a most vigorous defense of the Jewish religion, he suddenly turns from it and against it with the same zeal and self-sacrifice. Let us now proceed to less familiar exhibitions of individualism.

Passing to Greece, we find in the Homeric age, strictly speaking, no individuals. The same epithets are applied to men, to women, to gods, and even to animals. Men differ in political power and importance, in personal prowess and in some other attributes; but they bear no clearly marked individual stamp. The only individualist, the only man who has the courage to question the justice of the existing order of things; to protest against the selfishness and tyranny of one of the chiefs, is made as ridiculous as possible by the poet. Not only are his words declared to be habitually ill-timed; even his personal appearance is caricatured. It is very improbable that there ever was such a travesty of the human form divine in the Greek camp as Thersites is represented to have been. Some of his fellow-soldiers are disposed to applaud his boldness, rash as he may be, but when it comes to a display of courage they stand back. In the lyric age which followed there appear some striking personalities, especially Solon; but he championed the cause of a class rather than a principle that was distinctively individualistic. He was not in any sense a "come-outer" like Paul or Socrates. The last-named is by far and in many ways the most remarkable man Greece produced: verily there was none like unto him before him, nor did any come after him such as he was. His conduct is

particularly interesting when he undertakes to reconcile the conflicting claims of the individual and the paramount demands of the State. On the one hand he was an individualist of the most marked type. His theory of morals was diametrically opposed to that which was in practice about him; and with him theory and practice were as closely united as the two sides of a disc. While he maintained that ethics is not a matter of convention and that every one must decide moral questions for himself, he held with equal tenacity that all men will reach like conclusions if they give the problem sufficient thought and penetrate to foundation principles. There was hardly a feature of his private life in which he followed convention. Yet he was a law-abiding citizen. Although condemned to death for a crime of which he was demonstrably innocent, and merely the victim of a passing frenzy, he nevertheless obstinately refused to make the slightest effort to save himself and forbade his friends interfering in his behalf. There is every reason to believe if he had gone into exile for a few months he could soon have returned in triumph. But he would listen to no compromise. He acknowledged the right of the State to take his life while denying the power of the State to change a single fundamental principle. This point is clearly brought out in the Defense, and there is little doubt that Plato has correctly defined his position. In Socrates we have thus a singular combination of collectivist and individualist. It was particularly in ethics that he stands apart from his age and his countrymen. For him there is no convention in morals unless the community unites upon the standard of the individual man. To harm an enemy, even in requital, is just as much a deviation from the path of rectitude as to do him an injury for any other reason. Although in his case the commonwealth clearly contravened the unalterable law of justice, he calmly submitted to his fate. He stoutly maintained that the dikasts had perverted the statutes of their native city and that upon them and their children would fall the penalty for this evil deed. Here we have the same doctrine that Plutarch enunciates more fully in his Delay of the Deity. He maintains that a State is a permanent unity even more than a human body, yet we do not speak of an old man as being some one else from the person he was in early life. It is worth while to note in this connection that in ancient Greece there was no denial of the doctrine that

the State may be guilty of wrong-doing. Time and again exiles were permitted to return by the vote of the same body that had banished them. Under similar conditions property and civil rights were restored. In this respect Greek antiquity went farther than any modern commonwealth, so far as I have been able to learn. In our day, if a man is convicted of a crime and imprisoned, but is afterward found to be innocent, he has no statutory redress. The government will not repair the wrong it has done him except that in special cases he can recover material damages, or have damnatory resolutions expunged. Socrates' inconsistency was therefore only on the surface. He had acknowledged allegiance to Athens during a long life and had refused to go elsewhere; for with all her faults she was, in his opinion, better governed than any other city. In other words, he could not at the last moment repudiate a claim that for all the years of his mature life he had recognied as just.

Regarded from the individualistic point of view there are few more interesting personalities in the world's gallery of worthies than Seneca and Plutarch. Although the latter looked almost exclusively to the past he was optimistic through and through. He was satisfied with himself and with the world at a time when the latter presented to the careful observer an extremely hopeless outlook. He does not show an inkling of regret or repentance or sinfulness. Though not a fatalist in the ordinary sense of the term he writes as if he thought what was to come would come, while at the same time believing to a considerable extent in the freedom of the will and therefore in personal responsibility. Seneca, on the other hand, is constantly tossed between the pillar of wish and the post of achievement. He is full to overflowing of dissatisfaction with himself. He does not call himself a sinner, yet he often confesses that he followed the worse when he was free to follow the better. No one who studies Seneca will be surprised that he is frequently taken for a Christian, but mistakenly none the less. Intellectually he is a determinist; ethically he is a champion of free will. He felt that his environment was detrimental to his highest moral interests, yet he could not free himself from it. Though superior to it and alone in it, there was for him a strange fascination in the stir and bustle and intrigue of the Roman capital. Hence we find him making frequent excuses for the low moral plane on which

he lived. Professor Nash, in his Genesis of the Social Conscience, maintains that with St. Augustine's Confessions a new element entered into the literature of the West. While this position is sound, in a sense, the fundamental principle is clearly enunciated in the Old Testament and the doctrine fully elaborated in the New. When Joseph said: "How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" he plainly postulates an individual conscience and personal responsibility. The Psalms are full of the same thought. "I acknowledge my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I will confess my transgression unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." The word *sin* occurs in the Old Testament more than 250 times; and owing to the parallelism of the Hebrew diction, there are several synonyms. The story of Bellerophon told in the Iliad bears some resemblance to that of Joseph, and it is interesting to compare the moral standard of the two narrators: their points of view differ widely. It is generally held that the Jewish conception of sin is diametrically opposed to that of the Christian, the latter laying great stress upon it, the former none at all. The confession of sin is not only an acknowledgment of weakness; it is a marked individualistic trait. A community can not commit a sin, although according to primitive ideas it could be guilty of a crime. But the individualism that manifests in confession was soon lost sight of in the early Church. If the laymen could obtain forgiveness only through the intercession of the priest his personality counted for little. Thenceforward the whole body of believers consisted of the upper stratum, the priesthood, not very numerous relatively; and the lower stratum, the laymen who constituted the main mass. No salvation for the latter was possible except in extreme cases save through the medium and intercession of the hierarchy that could make its own terms. If the modern Jew has no consciousness of sin, it is plain from what has been said above that the position finds no countenance in the Old Testament. It is a commonplace of ancient history that with the age of Alexander, or more especially with that of his successors, a long period of mediocrity set in that embraced all forms of mental activity. Except in a few departments, the minds of men were turned toward the past almost exclusively, even the present receiving but little attention. Henceforward for almost a thousand years it was the chief am-

bition of most writers to express their thoughts in the language of Plato and Xenophon, or to some extent in that of Homer. During this period the only creative forces in the realm of mind appeared in the person of Semites, or at least of half-Greeks. They were either atheists or Neo-Platonists or Christians. But even here the material was not new; it was merely dealt with from a more or less novel point of view. Old Hellas breathed out her life when republican Greece was crushed. In Rome the decay set in somewhat later, but its character was in the main the same. Like the Greeks, the Romans did not write as they spoke; their models of style were chiefly Cicero and Vergil.

Seeck, in his *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt,* affirms that there was no improvement in military tactics after the age of Augustus and that in spite of the increasing perils which threatened the empire from the barbarians, nothing was done to make the Roman legions more effective. We have here a most remarkable phenomenon in the psyche of the ancient world. What was the cause of this stagnation? The explanation of the writer just quoted seems to be in conformity to all the known factors of the problem. He contends that the almost continuous internecine strife in the Greek States gradually carried off the men who made themselves conspicuous in the domain of politics. It is well known that Socrates refrained from taking any part in the government of his native city because to do so would have put his life in constant jeopardy. Yet in spite of his aloofness, his refusal to aid in making an illegal arrest came very near proving fatal to him. Not only the frequent wars between the different States, but the constant internal feuds gradually eliminated the capable, the enterprising, and the innovators. Athens was much more powerful in men and recources in the time of Philip of Macedon than in the time of Darius and Xerxes; nevertheless the burning words of Demosthenes awoke but a feeble response in the minds of his degenerate countrymen. When vigorous action and vigorous action alone could have saved them from the clutches of the northern barbarian and invader they did little more than legislate and threaten and send ambasseys. In Rome, beginning with the era of the Gracchi and ending with the establishment of the empire, we find a similar condition of things. The two noble sons of Cornelia were the forerunners of a struggle between the average man and the aristocracy that

has been coming to the fore in one way and another up to our own time. In the city on the Tiber the struggle was particularly bitter and the result more than usually disastrous. It came to an end only with the establishment of absolute rule. A more abject, spiritless, fawning, cowardly set of men than the Roman senators it would be hard to find anywhere. The few, who were now and then bold enough to assert themselves, were speedily gotten out of the way. They received no support from their peers and were often in the situation of the wounded wolf that is devoured by the rest of the pack. What was perhaps the most determined and persistent effort to eradicate every vestige of individualism from society was made by what we may call the early Church; but it was kept up for more than fifteen hundred years. St. Paul's writings were the nucleus, the assumed *fons et origo* of this long drawn out contest, although there is little doubt that he did not intend the rigorous consequences to be drawn from his doctrines that his expositors believed or professed to believe to find in them. Before the middle of the third century Christianity, or rather the Christian Church had fully entered upon a struggle for the supremacy in all matters of thought and speculation. Albeit, we can hardly speak of the Christian Church as if it were a finished organism since the forces that in the course of events came to be branded as heretical and heterodox were by no means weak or inactive or lacking in courage. Ecclesiastical council after council, beginnig with that of Nicaea in 325 and ending with that of Trent in 1563, or even with the Vatican Council in 1869, denounced every form of belief which the majority decided would be called heretical. For a long time there was virtually a struggle between the West and the East; for the Greeks, perhaps by virtue of inherited traits, were generally the champions of the larger liberty. However by a curious contradiction, the eastern branch in the course of time, doubtless because it fell more and more under the control of a single autocratic government, became far more rigid and stereotyped than the western. It may be regarded as a fixed fact that the Greek Church has not advanced a single step in a thousand years. Such inflexibility can not be charged against the Roman branch. Eventually the orthodox hierarchy triumphed; for not only did the formula of St. Cyprian, "extra ecclessiam nulla salus," find acceptance, but in the course of time

it came to be interpreted in a much more exclusive sense than the writers of the New Testament, or perhaps even the author of the dictum, intended. Against such a compact body neither polytheism nor what was still called philosophy could make headway or even keep from losing ground. It followed therefore from the very nature of the case that, when Constantine decreed that henceforth Christianity should be the religion of the empire he acted prudently although it is estimated that not more than one-fifth of his subjects professed the new faith. Five men working harmoniously toward the same end are far more effective than four times this number working for half a dozen different ends. Christianity was not only an active, it was an aggressive force; for the hierarchy were a unit against tolerating any serious differences of belief, of faith and practice. There was friction enough, but it was generally between the Church and the State, between the temporal and the spiritual power. Each party was equally eager to suppress all independence of thought and action. That all individual initiative was completely stifled by the year one thousand is evident from the inability of men to do anything except in masses. The crowds that joined the Crusades had hardly more personal will than a flock of sheep which follows the bell-wether when he suddenly starts to run. These masses knew in a vague sort of a way what they wanted, but everything else was a blank. Charlemagne was a conspicuous and forceful character; but he manifested no desire to interfere with the ordinances of the hierarchy. There is no doubt however, arguing from analogy, that if his educational innovations had had a trial of three or four generations the religious ferment that broke out at the beginning of the sixteenth century would have come five hundred years earlier, and probably with less acrimony and violence. It is not easy to determine why this rigid mediaevalism began to give way just when it did. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the feudal system prevailed all over Europe. The supremacy of the pope in the affairs of the world, whether temporal or spiritual, was complete. Knighthood was in full flower and chivalry was the badge of a universal brotherhood. In Dante protests begin to be heard, albeit with a feeble and faltering voice. He finds among the damned certain persons who had died in the odor of sanctity. The rise of the Hanseatic League also gives evidence of the beginnings of

a ferment in the minds of men. On the other hand one can not but be struck with the extraordinary timidity displayed by the ruling aristocracy in the closing years of the Middle Ages and the opening age of the modern era in asserting their privileges or what they claimed as such. The earliest examples of civic courage are found where we should least expect it,—in Spain. In the northern and northeastern provinces, the nobility and the ruling aristocracy in the cities stoutly resisted the encroachments of the royal power a century before the granting of Magna Charta. Nor did this resistance come to an end until the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Henceforth all evidence of individualism in Spain was crushed as soon as it made its appearance, except in domains where it could conflict with neither Church nor State. Every one knows how deplorable the result has been.

The question is pertinent to the present discussion whether the happiness of mankind is greatest when the individual counts for least or for most. So far as Europe is concerned the average man, or we might perhaps better say "the downmost man," probably counted for less at the close of the Middle Age than at any other period of the world's history. With respect to France it may be mentioned that Rambaud cites several competent authorities who have reached the conclusion that the country at the beginning of the fourteenth century had a population falling little short of the present, but that the plague of 1348 and the war of A Hundred Years reduced the number of inhabitants by one half, and that the conditions did not begin to improve until shortly before 1500 and then only very slowly. It is generally believed that the population of Germany, at the beginning of the Thirty Years' War was about sixteen millions. There is hardly any doubt that in some parts of the empire it was reduced to one-fifth at the end of these three terrible decades. It is the contention of many Roman Catholic historians, foremost among whom is Janssen, that the rise of individualism in religion was fraught with disaster in many forms to Christendom. It is probable that the three centuries beginning with 1348 were exceptionally disastrous for Europe as a whole. The burden of misfortune was not, however, equally heavy on all countries at the same time. Nor is it possible to determine whether religion or politics was most largely responsible for the "Iliad of evils" that from time to time came upon Europe during these three

centuries, since it is impossible to consider the two motives separately. The most forceful individual in the domain of science was Bacon, but he did not go as far as his later contemporary did in philosophy, or more properly metaphysics. When Cartesius took his stand upon the dictum *Cogito, ergo sum,* he declared his independence of all anterior experience and of all objective testimony. It is not easy to conceive a greater contrast between two points of view than that of this Frenchman and Aristotle, the latter maintaining that the State exists before the individual, the former, that neither the State nor in fact anybody need be considered outside of each separate personality. It is no wonder that such a bold innovator in the realm of thought found it advisable to keep himself concealed during more than half his mature life; his fundamental postulate was directly opposite to the Church and to all preceding thought.

Individualism has manifested itself in various ways in the history of the world. Sometimes it appears as mere brute force in which the destructive instincts of an entire people are discharged through one man. A striking example of this kind was the careers of Genghis Khan and also of Tamerlane. The lives of these two human monsters were like the passing of a hurricane that leaves nothing but death and destruction in its track. Sometimes an individual in the incarnate longing and aspiration of a people for some real or imaginary good towards which their thoughts have long been directed. In the domain of politics the first Napoleon is the most notable example in the history of modern times. The case of Caesar is somewhat similar, while that of Alexander is wholly unlike either. For a long time Napoleon did not disappoint the hopes that had been centered in him. He brought a measure of peace to his distracted country, or at least placed her in a position to command the respect of the powers that had come to look upon her as an easy prey. He made the attainment of justice for every citizen far less difficult. He opened the way for talent that had hitherto been hopelessly blocked. It was not until after he had deserved well of his country that he began to abuse the trust his fellow-citizens had reposed in him and perverted it to his own aggrandizement. He used the confidence of his subjects which he had gained by posing as a republican to betray them to the very power from which he had delivered them,—the aristocracy. It

is extremely probable that if France had been permitted to pursue its course of orderly development it would be farther on the road of genuine and permanent progress than it is to-day. It is to be noted that the French revolt which began in 1789 was only to a limited extent individualistic. It was essentially a collective protest against abuses of long standing, and it may be questioned whether it produced a strongly marked individual, unless Mirabeau be such a one. But it did bring to the fore a number of radical types. There was, however, no really superior personality brought upon the scene until it had in a great measure run its course. This lack was a great misfortune for the French people and they paid dearly for it. A Cromwell, if a French Cromwell had been possible, would speedily have brought order out of chaos, as Napoleon did, but with far different consequences. Even Mirabeau, if he had lived longer, would probably have failed because he was not a military man. Then, too, his past life rested upon him like an incubus which he could not shake off. I believe that every people, in any measure organized into a workable government and as a political unit, have a natural desire not merely to obtain justice for themselves but also to grant it to others. I do not believe that the cry for justice, whether mute or expressed, is a mere longing for power, a desire of the oppressed to exchange places with the oppressors, as Nietzsche recently maintained, and as the Sophists declared more than two milleniums ago.

It may be remarked parathentically that we hear a good deal in these later days about the Stirner-Nietzsche *Herrenmoral* as if it were something new. In the Gorgias of Plato we find one of the speakers maintaining that injustice is a term invented by the weaker to designate the condition of those who have less than they want "whereas nature herself intimates that it is just for the better to have more than the worse, the more powerful than the weaker." Among animals, cities, and races nature shows "that justice consists in the superior ruling over and having more than the weaker." In the Republic we are told that "The State arises out of the needs of mankind; no one is self-sufficing, but all of us have many wants. In the larger quantity, which is the State, justice is likely more easily discovered. Then when any one of the citizens experiences any good or evil, the whole State will make his case their own, and will either rejoice or sorrow

with him." The fate of Achan is abhorrent to our ideas of justice. We often forget however, that governments adhered to the same principle until very recently. Corruption of blood and even the corruption of proximity occupy a prominent place in the jurisprudence of almost every European country. It is scarcely possible to conceive a human being existing alone, so closely are men bound up together for good or evil. These mutual and reciprocal relations give rise to the apparent paradox of Aristotle that the State is prior to the individual.

Individualism, if it is to be fruitful and permanently helpful to the race, must be directed towards truth and light. Stress should be laid on *direction,* for men may differ a good deal as to what is right, not so much as to aims but as to methods. We may be certain that such a colloquy as is reported by Thucydides to have taken place between the Athenian envoys and the Melian government, in which the former shamelessly assert the right of the stronger to rule over the weaker, never took place. It is the historian's dramatic way of bringing into bold relief the mental state that eventually brought signal retribution upon his native city. If men are to be real leaders,—and there will always be need of such,—they must lead in such directions that the course of events will engender successors to take their places, when they are called to retire therefrom, in the due order of events.

A study of the individualism of our day in its relation to socialism or collectivism brings out some curious contrasts with the forms that have preceded. In our democratic age we still find men moving in groups, but these groups are not the result of tradition; they are formed under the stimulus of volition and are exceedingly numerous. There is hardly a man or a woman of any intelligence in any one of the score of the foremost countries of the world who is not a member of some voluntary group of individuals formed for some specific purpose. Of these groups, not counting those that exist for a purely local object, some have a few members while the membership of others runs into millions. Their aims are political, social, religious, ethical, economic, scientific, literary, and what not? In his lecture on the history of civilization delivered almost a century ago, M. Guizot dwells upon the complex life of Europe in contrast with the comparatively simple life of Asia. This complexity has increased in a remarkable degree during the intervening period. More-

over, modern groups or even masses are no longer swayed to any considerable extent by prepossession or emotion. The intellect is the most important factor. While it is true that the intellect of many persons does not penetrate into the intricate problems of life deeply, it is at its weakest a more trustworthy guide than the feelings. We shall always find persons in groups, sometimes in considerable numbers, who are drawn together primarily by their emotional nature; but the intellect always approves or commends some temporal good they expect to effect. It would be as impossible to get up a crusade like those of the Middle Age as it would be to collect an agricultural colony for Greenland. It is exceedingly improbable that a duplicate of the first Napoleon will ever appear again among men.

Another influence or agency that greatly promotes deliberation and is adverse to excitement is the press. The most "lurid rhetoric" when it appeals to the feelings through cold type, appeals far less strongly than when it is addressed to the ear by the living voice. Besides, the standard by which men judge their fellows, whether of the past or the present, is no longer primarily one of power but of goodness; not one of destruction but of construction. It is a significant sign of the times that the vote taken some years ago by a Parisian journal on the question: "Who was the greatest Frenchman?" resulted in assigning the Corsican bandit to the fourth place. The history of the world proves conclusively that men can accomplish nothing without leaders; but the evidence is equally convincing, that they are almost as often led in a wrong as in a right direction. Men of exceptional ability frequently gain the confidence of their fellows by appealing to their sense of right, to their altruistic sentiments, then mislead them to serve their own ends. The method adopted by Cyrus to lure the Ten Thousand into a war against his brother is typical of a countless number of instances. "Homo homini aut deus aut lupus," says the proverb. Too often, unfortunately what many persons suppose to be a god turned out to be a wolf. Circumstances brought about the metamorphosis. So the ordinary man, to say nothing of the man at the bottom of the social scale, is in constant danger of being deceived, if he follows another. Albeit, he can not go alone. The hope of the future then lies in its increasing intelligence; in conditions that will make at least a fair majority of men in a measure competent to

determine their actions upon grounds of reason. We are slowly approaching a realization of the saying that "The man who would be the greatest among you must act as your servant." It is just as impossible for a community to bring an idea into the world as it is to bring a living being into the world. To a certain extent and within certain limits all men are molded by their environment. Ideas must have an appropriate psychic soil in which to germinate and grow. But if men are of any account their individuality can never be suppressed; it will assert itself for good or bad, in helping men to rise or in crushing them down, in enlightening them or in making the darkness about them thicker. The man who stands for something will accomplish something either good or bad. And no man knows what he can do until he tries. He who allows himself to be borne down and obscured by those about him is a weakling. He who fights no battles wins no victories, although he may sometimes be defeated. If a man is always concerned about his own ease or his own safety; if he always stops to consider what an unusual step is worth to him, he is of little account to his fellow-men. It is better to live in a cabin and on the plainest food than to dwell in a palace and fare sumptuously every day, if the former condition means the accomplishment of something, the latter, of nothing. This is the most impressive lesson of the past. It is the great lesson of human experience. Nor will it be superseded by any other until that which is perfected has come.

Athens, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

THE DESIRABILITY AND POSSIBILITY OF A UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.

BY REV. T. F. DORNBLASER, D.D.

"Voices for union in the Lutheran Church of America, have become frequent and loud. Whether they are all intelligent and well directed, is a question that admits of discussion. It is not always the case, that where there is most clamor, most genuine wisdom is found."

Much of the cry of union among denominations, as well as in the Lutheran Church, is empty and void of sound principles.

We must all admit, that the present divided state of our Lutheran Church is not a desirable or satisfactory one. Upon the desirability of a union there can be no diversity of sentiment on the part of those who have, at heart, the highest welfare of Lutheranism in America. Whatever practical difficulties there may be in the way, and however much some may justify our divisions, on account of differences in doctrinal views, usages, language, or nationality, yet it must be confessed, that if we could harmonize, and unitedly co-operate, in the great work assigned us, it would be far better, as well as far more consonant with Christian sentiment both in and out of the Lutheran Church.

Depth and earnestness of Christian feeling, never can be reconciled to such divisions, except as the less of two evils. The prayer of Christ, that His disciples might all be one, finds a response in every Christian heart.

"There are, large and small, twenty-three different, and differing bodies or synods of Lutherans in the United States. Each of these bodies is an organization in itself. There is among these twenty-three bodies, as a whole, but a small measure of co-operation in the work of education, publication, missions and charities. Between some of these synods there is no fellowship at the altar or in the pulpit, nor are members dismissed in a fraternal way to, or received by, congregations of synods other than their own."

"In view of this lack of unity, fellowship and co-operation

among us, the millions of Christians outside, look upon the Lutherans in America as selfishly segregated in the twenty-three separate bodies, each having its own organization and each so cherishing its peculiarities in a separatistic and somewhat antagonistic spirit at times, that they practically constitute twenty-three Lutheran denominations, each of which has so much of the sect-spirit that its own peculiarities are more to it than the interests, the work, and the unity and fellowship of the whole." —Dr. Manhart.

Some recent occurrences have combined to give additional force to the desire for *Lutheran union.*

The happy re-union of the Old and New School Presbyterians, after a separation of thirty years, and the more recent return of the Cumberland Presbyterians to the old, though somewhat revised Westminster Standard, have caused the pulse of Christian union to beat higher in the churches.

The Prussian union between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, involving possibly nine-tenths of the Lutherans of the German Empire, is certainly administering a severe rebuke to the separatistic unfraternal spirit among the divided and isolated Lutheran Synods of America. If Lutherans and Reformed can fellowship in the same church and commune at the same altar in the fatherland—the home of Luther and Melanchthon, ought it not be possible for Lutherans of the same faith in America to compromise their differences, and fellowship together in one and the same Church of the Reformation?

What a mighty power our Church could be for righteousness in this land, if she presented a united front against the growing forces of infidelity and Romanism. The earnest and united cooperation of Protestantism is necessary to save this nation from the evil forces that threaten its overthrow.

But ardently as we desire, and fervently as we would pray for a union of our dismembered Church, we would still deprecate an unrighteous and baseless alliance. How can two walk together except they be agreed?

In an article written by Dr. G. H. Gerberding, in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY of 1888, July number, he speaks of the obstacles in the way of union, as follows:

"There are those who ask too much. They are hyper orthodox. They out-Luther Luther. They are given to hair-split-

ting distinctions and unreasonable extractions. They belong to that school of heresy-hunters who discovered several hundred dangerous errors in Arndt's "True Christianity," and who condemned Spener, Francke, and Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. Their Lutheranism consists largely in deductions from the confessions, and deductions from these deductions. They often judge a man's Lutheranism by the cut of the coat he preaches in, by the shape of the bread he administers in the communion, by the motion of his hands in pronouncing the benediction, or by the architectural arrangement of the church he preaches in. And if forsooth one should carry the Lutheran doctrine into an un-Lutheran Church, and preach it to a non-Lutheran congregation, they are ready to hold up their hands in holy horror! The part of the Augsburg Confession in which such Lutherans find most pleasure is in the damnants pronounced against those who differ from them.

Is this the type of Lutheranism that God in His Providence first planted in this land? Was this the Lutheranism of Muhlenberg and the Fathers?

Even if it were desirable to form a union on the basis of these extremists, it would be folly to ever expect the whole Church to be educated up to them."

Whether Dr. Gerberding is of the same opinion, as he was in 1888, makes no material difference, the facts stated remain, and confront the Church, to this day, as an obstacle to a harmonious union.

In the QUARTERLY of the same year, Dr. Wolf of Gettysburg Seminary, corroborates the views of Dr. Gerberding with reference to the Lutheran attitude of Dr. Muhlenberg.

"Mere orthodoxy of teaching was not with him (Muhlenberg) the paramount concern. The life is more than the form. He rejoiced when his members would from time to time meet together for the reading of the Word, prayer and singing. For his position on these measures he suffered persecution before coming to this country.

The clerical dignitaries were so prejudiced against his Hallean Pietism that they applied the "Galesburg Rule" to him. He was not allowed to preach in a Lutheran pulpit. He was officially commanded to desist from holding "Pietistical Conventicles," under the menace of imprisonment. His American

biographer, Dr. Mann, says, "Muhlenberg's Pietism brought him into a certain affinity with all those in whom he noticed the symptoms of a living personal spirituality," men like Whitefield, and the famous revivalists, G. and W. Tennent. In his intercourse with such men, he found some spiritual refreshment and encouragement, and the doctrines which formed a high and strong barrier between their respective church bodies were left in the background." Dr. Wolf adds this testimony from one of the leaders of the General Council, "The trunk from which our Church has grown in this country is Muhlenberg, and not the Reformers and dogmaticians of the latter half of the sixteenth century. You cannot wrench the branch, which has thus its vital and natural growth, from its parent stock, and graft it upon the hard old stem of long past centuries and beyond the sea."

Dr. F. P. Manhart, in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY of April, 1910, characterizes Lutheranism in America as follows: "Generic Lutheranism, plus certain other peculiarities, constitute Lutheran body number one. Generic Lutheranism, plus certain other peculiarities, constitute Lutheran body number two. And so on, until we have the twenty-three Lutheran denominations, one or more symbols in addition.

Few persons know or care to know all the types and shades of the peculiarities of the twenty-three American Lutheran bodies.

It is manifest that in America there are two classes of Lutherans, the generic and the particularistic.

The Generic Lutheran accepts confessionally, the Augsburg Confession; nothing more, nothing less. The Particularistic Lutheran accepts confessionally the Augsburg Confession and one or more symbols in addition.

The generic class is practically one. The particularistic class is legion."

In quoting from Dr. Schmauk in *Lutheran Review,* Jan. 1908, Prof. Manhart says, "He finds the Church of his fathers, in so divided a state that even to some of her own ministers and to many of her people, as to the masses of intelligent Christians outside of her folds, she is an unaccountable "congeries of minor sects."

In view of all the facts above mentioned, we come to the vital question connected with the subject before us: Is there a possibility of a united Lutheran Church in America? Our answer

is, "Not in this generation, but we hope it may be realized before the close of the twentieth century." All things are possible with God. If the Holy Spirit had His unhindered way in the hearts of the clergy and laity of the different synods, it would not require a decade to bring into a unified whole the dismembered Lutheranism of the United States; marking a most glorious advance in the fulfilment of Christ's prayer for the unity of His followers.

But there is a human side to all movements in Church and State. It is human to err. Many men have many minds, and the larger the number, the more minds there are to harmonize.

First, if the basis of the proposed union demands uniformity in worship, and unanimity in opinion in all points of doctrine, it will prove a failure. The more people you want to stand on the same platform, the broader must be your platform. In statecraft you can narrow down your platform to prohibition and municipal ownership, but such a party finds itself very lonesome when the people begin to record their ballots. So in ecclesiastical matters, the narrower and more sectarian you make your creed the less you find willing to stand with you. Some men are so narrow and dogmatic as to constitute a sect or insect by themselves. "Differences have existed in the Church in divers forms for 1800 years. In the Apostolic Church diversity is manifest. The One Spirit revealed Himself in many gifts, and the One Christ, was represented by the apostles in various aspects. Different tendencies in germinal form are already active."

Peter, Paul and John are theologically representatives of distinct movements, which in later times exhibit "so many progressive stages in the education of Christendom and its advance toward perfection."

After the days of the apostles, divisions became more marked. Various schools were established, namely, that of Asia Minor, of Alexandria, of Carthage, and of Antioch.

One of these, Asia Minor, was strictly Biblical, the one at Alexandria, "idealistic," the one at Carthage, "realistic and practical," while that at Antioch was "critical in its study of the sacred manuscripts."

Debates and controversies arose. Different shades of doctrine were emphasized. Bitter strifes prevailed between bishops and teachers of theology, culminating in the rending asunder

of Christendom, into the Eastern and Western divisions, the Greek and Roman Churches, as they exist to this day. The cause of disunion in this case was principally governmental.

Within the compass of the papacy itself, divisions exist, subordinate, it is true, to one authority, still clearly distinct in cast. Differences of doctrinal view characterize some of the leading orders, as for example, the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Jansenists, and the Jesuits. These have constituted, in the Romish Church, sects and parties, "contending not less for religious and doctrinal principles, than for policies of administration." As Bishop Bedell, an Irish Catholic, well says, "Jesuists, Dominicians and Franciscans, warring with fiercest denominational rancor, within an organization that is falsely proclaimed to be one and undivided."

Second. The attempt of the General Council to bring about a union—on the basis of extreme symbolism, is destined to prove a failure. "There are three general ways," says Dr. Krauth, "in which the sense of unity in the Church can be officially expressed. One is by profession of the same creed, the second by admission to public teaching, the third is by reception at the altar."

"In the position assumed by the General Council," says Dr. Valentine, in his masterly article on the "Fundamental Principles of the General Council," "all these three ways of official expression of oneness, by confession, by admission to pulpit and altar fellowship, are turned down in a declaration of rejection, separation and exclusion."

"The council's principle of exclusion of fellowship with other parts of the Church practically asserts for the Lutheran Church the attitude and character of a schism,—a schism by self-exclusion from communion with the Church Catholic. It withdraws from that which it interprets and confesses to be the communion of saints."

It must sound strange to some rigid symbolists to hear Dr. Ort say, in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, "that the true unity of the Church is not secured by the adoption of a creed. It is sometimes said that all true Christian unity must arise out of a common faith. A creed is simply the formal statement of how the Christian mind apprehends divine truth. This outward development of doctrine however, is consequent on an inner growth

of apprehension. The Christian Church did not begin her career with a well-defined statement of doctrine. At her beginning she had no creed. More than three centuries passed until she laid before the world in definite statement her belief; and yet from the commencement she was the one, holy, Catholic Church. There was always manifest and active the true unity of Christendom."

"Creeds are fallible; while they contain a divine element, still they are a human expression. Distinction must always be made between form and content."

"We deem it proper, hence, to maintain that the true unity of the Church is not secured by any creed, but that this unity is ground and source for the common symbol."

It is certain, therefore, that no union of Lutherans in America can be effected along the lines of exclusive and rigid symbolism. Neither is it possible to rally any number of synods under the banner of a radical or extreme liberalism. American Lutherans are not ready to cut loose from all historical and doctrinal connection with the Lutheran Church of the past.

This union, therefore, must be effected, if at all, on the lines of generic and conservative Lutheranism. It is possible by this conservative position to unite the great body of Lutherans, lying or standing, between the two extremes of radicalism and symbolism; "a Lutheranism that holds fast to the Augsburg Confession, and the doctrines on which the Reformation hinged; that in the reception of the confession leaves room for proper Christian liberty and such honest difference of opinion, as do not affect the essential or fundamental truths of the Confession; that admits of development and improvement, based on the divine Word, and in harmony with the growth and development of the Church Catholic."

This position is in harmony with the spirit of primitive, original Lutheranism. It is well known that the signers of the Augsburg Confession were not entirely agreed among themselves on all points of doctrine, and on the very points that have been subjects of difference of opinion ever since.

They subscribed with the understanding of liberty in their interpretation of it. This liberty was exercised by Melanchthon, even to the extent of altering the Confession, so as to make it better express the different views prevailing, or to be more ac-

ceptable to different parties. This revised Confession was so well and so generally received, that for many years scarcely any other was known. And this, be it remembered, in the very lifetime of Luther. It was not then used in the sense of a confession so rigidly binding that its reception, in "every statement, in its native, original, and only sense," was deemed essential to the very name Lutheran; but as a free Christian confession containing—"the substance of doctrine preached and taught in our churches."

In the matter of forms, ceremonies, and usages, the Church at that early day inculcated and exercised a wide range of liberty. The Augsburg Confession expressly teaches that, "it is not necessary that uniform ceremonies should be everywhere observed." The same view is reiterated and amplified in the Apology. The attempt to carry us back, or keep us back, to the forms and ceremonies practiced three hundred years ago, finds no sanction or authority in the spirit of primitive Lutheranism. This conservative position does no violence to any man's conscience who holds to the fundamentals as taught in our Confession. It does not prevent any one from accepting all that is in the Symbolical Books, but he must not insist on making his faith a rule for all other Lutherans.

It aims at soundness of faith and Christian freedom united in one consistent system, and is unwilling to sacrifice either.

On this basis, the most liberal conservative and the most symbolic Lutheran can unite, provided only that they respect each other's convictions and rights. Luther and Melanchthon lived and labored harmoniously in the same Church, and who wants a Lutheran Church that would exclude either? Professing to build on the foundation they helped to lay, we would not exclude either of them from the building.

Some lessons might be learned from the Lutheran countries of Europe as to the basis and method of securing and maintaining a permanent union of the Lutheran Church. The history of the Scandinavian Churches is especially deserving of our attention.

Denmark publically accepted the Protestant Reformation as early as 1536, and later accepted the Augsburg Confession as a Biblical creed.

The controversies raging in Germany were fortunately not transplanted to Denmark.

The Danish Church refused to accept the Book of Concord. They said, "The book evidently contains a doctrine which is new and strange to us and our churches; on this account the unity, which to the praise of God has been maintained in this kingdom, is liable to be destroyed if the book is made use of." The first copy sent to Frederick II in 1588, was thrown into the fire and the sale of the book was prohibited by regal authority. The Word of God, the three ecumenical symbols, the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Shorter Catechism, were accepted, and remain as the doctrinal basis to this day. Denmark has kept her Protestant forces well together without the Book of Concord. Out of a population of 2,500,000, 98 1-2 per cent. belong to the Lutheran Church. The Reformed Church could scarcely get a foothold. The Lutheran position was broad enough and liberal enough for all evangelical Christians to stand upon.

Norway, with a population of 2,300,000, reports that over 97 per cent. belong to the Lutheran Church of the Augsburg Confession.

The same conservative basis, as in Denmark has been maintained to this day, and with equal if not better results. The church life in Norway was richly blessed in the nineteenth century, which opened with a great religious revival, at the head of which was the lay preacher Hauge,—the founder of the Hauge Synod. Three other revival waves visited the country in more recent years. The faculty of the University of Christiania was thoroughly Lutheran, and its foremost theologians, Johnson and Caspari, gave the revival movement their hearty support by preaching and teaching a true living Christianity. As a consequence, Norway has a clergy of high order, spiritually as well as intellectually. The Hauge Synod in the United States is decidedly averse to tightening the confessional bonds. They stand for the pietism of Hauge and Spener, emphasizing the lay element against the "priestly order," and are opposed to High Church ritualism, forbidding its ministers to chant, or to wear the clerical robe, nor will they accept more than the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Shorter Catechism. With the exception of one synod, all the Norwegian Lutherans in this country, accept only the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Smaller Catechism. The largest body, the "United Norwegian Synod," num-

bers 150,000 communicants. The Hauge Synod 37,000 and the Free Church 38,000 communicants.

The Norwegian Missourians, in connection with the General Conference number 67,000. Negotiations have been going on between these synods to form a United Norwegian Church in this country. Any attempts to make the Book of Concord a part of the confessional basis will widen the breach instead of bridging the chasm. It is plain, therefore, that Denmark and Norway have succeeded in a remarkable manner in holding the Protestant forces together under the broad, generic, and Scriptural banner of the primitive reformers, Luther and Melanchthon. It is a suggestive hint to American Lutherans. Sweden has a population of 5,175,000. Here the Lutheran is the State Church. Sweden is the most aristocratic of the Scandinavian countries. Her clergy is the most hierarchical. This accounts for her high Church tendencies. She has not taken so kindly to the revival movements as Denmark and Norway.

She is now paying the penalty for her confessional severity. A great many of the Swedes, both in the Old World and in the New, affiliate with the Waldenströmians, the Baptists, and the Methodists. The religious freedom proclaimed by law in 1869, and the admission to offices of State granted to dissenters, only served to encourage the exodus from the State Church. There is much party spirit in the Swedish Church, causing bitter feeling and schisms. Many of the laity emigrating to America, come with a deep seated prejudice against the State Church, and this accounts largely for their readiness to enter in such numbers, into other churches rather than the Swedish Lutheran. Another reason that has alienated them from their Swedish brethren, in this country, is because, the clergy have identified themselves with the most rigid and exclusive Lutheran bodies in America. The younger clergy in the *Augustana Synod* are beginning to break the ecclesiastical chains that have been binding them to a dead orthodoxy, and a pharisaical exclusivism, and are coming to the front in preaching a living gospel, and are becoming leaders in evangelism, temperance and civic righteousness.

Let us now turn to Germany, the birthplace, and rightful home of Lutheranism. If anywhere in the world, it is there,

that Lutheranism should be united and dominant as a force in Protestantism.

Germany, consisting of twenty-five States, has a population of 56,367,178. Of these 35,231,104 are Protestants, and 20,-327,913 Catholics. In 1900, the Catholics were in the minority in only three of the German States,—Alsace-Lorraine, Bavaria, and Baden. In all the other States the Catholics numbered less than 36 per cent. of the population.

In 1907, Prof. Gustav Kawerau, of the University of Breslau, published the following religious statistics of the Prussian Empire:[1] Evangelicals (State Church) 35,231,104, Old Lutherans 45,594, Old Reformed 14,543, United Brethren (Moravian) 4,031, Mennonites 13,876, Baptists 38,143, Methodists and Quakers 5,226, Apostolic Church (Irvingites) 32,215, Church of England 2,557.

Prof. Kawerau, laments the growth of the sects in the Fatherland. He urges upon the authorities to inaugurate a movement to counteract sects who make proselytes from the established Church. What is the best antidote to the sects? He disapproves of all persecution, and calling upon the police force. That only makes martyrs and injures the Church.

The only antidote worthy of the Church is to earnestly endeavor to satisfy with her own means the religious needs which lead her members to the sects.

Every appearance of a sect is a monition to the Church for her manifold shortcomings and abuses which can to some degree, at least, be remedied. Theodor Kolde, the eminent professor of the University of Erlangen, has formulated the principle "that in every sect there is a one-sided emphasis on a thought or work which is justified in itself and for the time neglected by the

1 Note.—Some may be interested in the latest religious statistics as given in the "New Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia," as pertaining to Germany:

Protestants in the Empire	27,646,852
Roman Catholics	22,094,492
Russian Orthodox	1,991
Greek Catholics	13,161
Dissenters, Baptists, Methodists, &c.	259,717
Jews	607,862
Mohammedans and Buddhists	909
Pantheists, Free Thinkers, &c.	12,024
Confessors of no religion	4,270

The Protestants constitute about two-thirds of the population

T. F. D.

Church." It is the business of the Church to do away with the general and special causes for the formation of sects. "There must be a richer and more living proclamation of the divine Word, a faithful pastoral call, the institution of subordinate religious meetings, a care for the fellowship needs of the awakened, the providing of societies within the Church for religious and moral training, a spiritual life and spirit-filled preaching of pastors, the keeping out of mercenaries from the ministry, a looking after discipline, a training of the Church officers in co-working in all the concerns of the society, and draw upon earnest members for work according to their gifts in edifying the Church, such as helping in Sunday Schools, care of the poor and sick, and in the smaller societies of the Church."

"What are the causes of the success of this propaganda? Why do the living members of the Church join the sects? Is it because of the special doctrines they preach?" "I think not," says Prof. Kawerau. "You must look deeper than that. It must be confessed that in our national Church, there are churchly and unchurchly, living and dead members. The sects allure the living members to their prospect of a communion of pure living Christians. These spiritually-minded members are needed in the Church to counteract the influence of the worldliness that naturally adheres to a State Church. All these things prepare the way for the sects. The craving for spiritual communion and not purer doctrine, constitutes the attractive power of the sect. Of course unworthy motives too frequently play a part, love of novelty, spiritual pride, insubordination, ambition, dogmatic disputatiousness, but these motives influence only a small number, and may be left out of the account."

This German professor, may paint the picture darker than it really is, and yet when we study the situation, we naturally inquire why it is, that in the land of Luther so few to-day, stand together under a strictly Lutheran banner. The Evangelical Church with its thirty-five millions of communicants, is proscribed by the Missourians, as un-Lutheran, and therefore they are engaged in a vigorous propaganda, by sending missionaries from America to their deluded brethren in the Fatherland. They have made some progress in establishing and maintaining an independent, separate Lutheran Church. But their numbers are equaled, if not exceeded by some of the other sects spoken of.

And the misfortune to their cause is, that when they are on a fair way of success, some bitter controversialist opens fire, and the forces are divided, and their strength and power is wasted in fighting among themselves. But the picture is not as dark as it looks on the surface. While the Lutheran name may be given up by the united evangelical forces of Germany, the Lutheran faith is still substantially maintained by 90 per cent. of the communicants in the established Church. The Augsburg Confession is accepted as the doctrinal basis in connection with the Lutheran and Reformed catechisms. The clergy and adherents of the Evangelical Union, are required only to subscribe to those doctrines in which the Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism agree, leaving the Lutheran and Reformed individual free to hold and confess, respectively, the doctrines distinctive of his own particular creed. This position they claim affords freedom of conscience, community of worship, fellowship at the altar, and maintains an orthodoxy—both scriptural and sufficiently comprehensive for all Evangelical Christians to unite upon.

About all that has been eliminated from the rigidly orthodox and exclusive position of the old or Missouri Lutherans is the unfraternal and separistic spirit—which characterizes their attitude toward all other branches of the Christian Church.

Nothing that is really fundamental to Christianity or to genuine primitive Lutheranism, has been given up by the Evangelical Union in Germany. It is hardly believable that the Lutheran theologians in connection with the State Church would be such a set of fools, as to sell out their Lutheran birthright for a mess of pottage. They believed it was possible, for the sake of a United Protestant Church, to surrender the name—"Lutheran," and yet preserve the essential and fundamental principles of the Reformation. If the Evangelical Church of Germany must be ruled out as un-Lutheran, then it will be necessary to revise our Lutheran statistics by the reduction of, at least, 25,000,000 of communicants.

But there are Lutheran theologians in America, as well as in Germany, who do not believe that the *'name'* is necessary to perpetuate the Lutheran faith.

At the banquet of the Martin Luther Society in New York some years ago, Dr. H. E. Jacobs rose to the sublime vision of the future Church when he said, "Perish every institution of

man's devising, call it General Council, General Synod, or what you please, however great the blessings which it has imparted in the past—provided the one faith of the Lutheran Church continue to be transmitted from generation to generation until that glad day when faith shall yield to the blessed sight of that Lord in whose unseen communion we now walk, and love made perfect shall kindle every eye and inspire every thought and word."

Years ago we heard some of our eloquent doctors say, that it was unfortunate that the name of a man, however great he might be should be nailed to the mast-head of our denominational ship; and they went so far as to suggest to us younger men, that the term "Evangelical" should always be capitalized, and the name Lutheran appear in nonpariel, and enclosed in brackets. It is certainly well-known, that if Luther's wish had been carried out, his name would never have been used to designate a denomination of Christians.

In America there is probably more prejudice against man-named churches, and boss-ruled parties than in any other country in the world. All the other leading denominations have eliminated the names of their founders. Calvin and Wesley are still honored and extolled in their literature, but they do not carry their names on their banners. We would naturally suppose that the Church of the German Reformation, if anywhere in the world, would bear the name of its founder in the land of its birth. But when you name a church after a certain man, it narrows the horizon of that church to the theology of that one man. The theologians of Germany are profound and independent thinkers, recognized teachers of the Christian world, and they do not propose to have their intellectual research circumscribed by the *ipse dixit* of one man. In this they do not mean to antagonize Luther, but rather seek to imitate him in his independent thinking. If Luther's dogmatism had not been magnified and emphasized by his enthusiastic friends in the adoption and practical enforcement of the Form of Concord, the Protestant Church of Germany might have continued to this day as a united body bearing the name of its recognized hero and founder.

The doctrinal basis insisted upon by the rigidly orthodox Lutherans was too exclusive and circumscribed, upon which to establish a national Church. Therefore the advocates and pro-

moters of *Evangelical Union,* determined to set aside the deductions and fine-spun theories of post-Reformation controversalists, and reaffirm only the primitive Confession presented and adhered to during the life-time of Luther and Melanchthon. We do not claim that it is necessary to surrender our distinctive name, to effect a union in our divided Church in America, but we do believe that the majority of those holding the Lutheran faith, inside and outside of our churches in this country, would be willing to stand together on a basis similar to that of the Evangelical Church of Germany. This would bring the American Church into sympathetic touch with the Fatherland as nothing else could possibly do. It would prepare the way for the immigrants from Germany to come directly into our churches by regular transfer, instead of going elsewhere as so many of them now do.

But as we remarked in the beginning, a union that will prove effectual and lasting, will not depend so much upon a common faith, as upon the unity of the spirit in personal fellowship with Jesus Christ on the part of each individual believer. It will require another Pentecost to bring the extremes of Lutheranism together. All things are possible with God. He is able to so harmonize the confusion of tongues and the diversity of opinions that all will speak and understand each other in the one universal language of Christian love.

To secure this much desired end, we would not recommend any *"new measures,"* so-called, but we would urge all Lutherans to labor and to pray for a revival of the "old power." The pentecostal period of Lutheranism, as the historian informs us, was from 1517 to 1546, from the nailing of Luther's Theses on the church door at Wittenberg to his death at Eisleben. Lutheranism, as its champion and founder intended, was to be nothing more nor less than the revival of Apostolic Christianity.

The day of so-called "New Measures" is passed. Stilts now take the place of the "Mourner's Bench." Penitents no longer kneel at the mercy seat; they are asked to stand up and be counted among the saved.

One thing must be said in behalf of those over-zealous pioneers, that in the congregations they served, and the colleges over which they presided, there was no lack of students for the ministry. More offered themselves than could be supported.

Young men could not resist the powerful appeals of those godly men, as many of the clergy now living can testify from personal experience.

We do not believe, however, that the introduction of any "New Measures" will help to bring about a Lutheran union in this country. But we do believe that a genuine revival of primitive Lutheranism, the return of the "Old Pentecostal Power," and a new baptism of the Holy Ghost, will solve the problem.

Love is the divine solvent. Faith without love is dead. "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love."

Do we believe then that a united Lutheran Church in America is within the range of possibility; that the demon of bitter controversy can be cast out and the angel of peace and union enthroned in our beloved Zion? We answer unhesitatingly, yes. But in the words of Jesus to His disciples in the presence of the demoniac: "Howbeit, this kind goeth not out but by prayer."

Chicago, Ill.

ARTICLE VII.

SAMUEL ALFRED ORT—A MEMOIR.

BY PROFESSOR L. H. LARIMER, D.D.

Samuel Alfred Ort, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Christian Theology, Theism and Ethics, in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, departed this life Friday, January 6, 1911.

His attainments as a scholar and theologian, his work as an educator, his long and faithful service in the church of his birth, and his love, and the conspicuous position of honor and usefulness which he filled in the work of Wittenberg College and the Seminary, together with the official positions of honor and trust which he had at different times occupied in the Church, and above all, the place which he won and held in the hearts of hundreds and thousands of his students and fellow-laborers in the Church—all make it obligatory upon us to give deep reverence to his memory.

He was born of godly parentage at Lewistown, Pa., Nov. 11, 1843. This factor of godly parentage was the first and supremest of all the natural factors which had to do with the making of that splendid type of physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual manhood which Dr. Ort possessed. Those who lived near to him were often impressed with the tender memory and affection which he cherished for his parents, and the debt of love which he felt he owed to them for the early training which he received from them in spiritual things. This rich inheritance of mind and spirit in the boy soon began to reach out to the mysteries about him, and so we find him taking a three years' course in an academy not far from his home, and then at the age of sixteen entering Wittenberg College from which institution he graduated with highest honors in the class of '63, at the age of nineteen.

He was recognized as a superior student, and pursued his studies in academy and college most thoroughly. He laid a deep and solid foundation upon which he built ever afterward.

After his graduation from college he studied theology two years, during which time he also acted as tutor in the preparatory department of the college. His first pastorate was at Find-

lay, Ohio, 1865-1868, which he resigned to accept a position as teacher of Latin and Literature in Hagerstown Female Seminary. After one year at Hagerstown he was called back to Wittenberg, where during the next four years he taught mathematics, English literature and logic. During part of this time he also did some teaching in sacred philology.

In 1874, he was again called to take up the work of a pastor, in the First Lutheran church, Louisville, Ky., which was then a mission. His work in Louisville, 1874-1879, was fruitful in the building up of a large Sunday School, and the laying of the foundation of a strong church, and the securing for our Church in that large and growing city a splendid future. From Louisville he was called to the pastorate of St. James, New York City, where he served for one year. In the summer of 1880 he was elected to the chair of Sacred Philology in Wittenberg Theological Seminary, which he accepted, and he entered upon his work in October of that year. In 1882, he was elected to the presidency of the college, in which important position he labored most arduously as teacher, administrator, preacher, lecturer, writer, and as one of the leaders in the Lutheran Church of the General Synod. For eighteen years he served the Church as President of the College, during which time many improvements were made, and the foundations for larger growth were laid.

Those were years of hard work. He bore in his body the marks of those years, but he was blessed, and the College grew and prospered through his labor and the other faithful laborers associated with him. In 1900 he resigned the presidency of the College, and by the authority of the Board of Directors assumed the professorship of Christian Theology and Mental Philosophy.

Other positions of honor and trust which he occupied are as follows: Secretary of General Synod 1873-1879; President of General Synod 1887; Editor-in-Chief of *Lutheran Evangelist* 1881-1885; Holman Lecturer in Gettysburg Theological Seminary 1887, on Article I of the Augsburg Confession.

The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by his Alma Mater in 1876; and in 1893 he received the degree of LL.D from Wooster University.

In 1872 he was married to Miss Ann Sentney of Louisville, Ky. Their union was blessed with eight children. He was a devoted father and husband.

In the summer of 1909 he suffered from a paralytic stroke from which he never fully recovered, being able to do but little teaching afterwards. But he was brave, hopeful and cheerful, in the trying experience when he had to relinquish the work which he loved so well. He was a patient sufferer. Day by day his physical strength grew less, until on the night of January 6, 1911, he entered into rest, and God took him home.

It is difficult to estimate his work and influence as an educator, a theologian, and leader in the Lutheran Church. However much we may cherish now what he did, as time goes on we will learn to value him still more highly. His life and attainments will grow upon us all—even those who knew him best, and loved him most.

Careful, just, and tender words have been spoken and written by those who were associated with him through long years.

Prof. D. H. Bauslin, D.D., gave a most beautiful and fitting tribute to his memory on the occasion of the funeral service, and in the *Lutheran World* has given a clear and appreciative estimate of him. Among other things Dr. Bauslin has written of him, "He had a noble enthusiasm for working in the lofty fields of truth, understanding many of the great problems of human thought and penetrating far into the processes of the human mind, impressing himself strongly on the young minds under his instruction. Few men placed as much emphasis upon the great theological principle of justifying faith. Few men could state truth with the lucidity and simplicity that were features of his strongest productions. More and more he advanced to an appreciation of the depth and fulness and richness of that apprehension of the gospel set forth in the theological treasures of our Church."

Prof. B. F. Prince, Ph.D., who worked with him through all the years of his professorship and presidency has borne this word of appreciation, "Dr. Ort was a man of peace and harmony. He never was contentious, magnifying little things into matters of conscience and making them the basis for disagreements that so often cause misunderstandings and quarrels in various associations of men. He never cared to say the last word on any controverted subject, but after expressing his views was willing to let the matter rest on the judgment of those who were alike concerned in it with himself."

President Heckert has written of him as "one of the greatest hearted men I ever knew. He loved his Church and Wittenberg College. We shall not in this generation lose the influence of that knightly soul gone out from us."

The funeral service was held in the Fourth Lutheran Church, Springfield, on the afternoon of January 9, 1911, and was conducted by his pastor, Rev. C. E. Gardner, assisted by Rev. S. E. Greenawalt, D.D. Professors, students, neighbors, and friends stood around his grave on the hill-side, and all must have thanked God for this man of faith, of hope, of love.

"Life's race well run,
Life's work well done,
Life's crown well won,
And now comes rest."

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE RELATION OF GENESIS I. TO THE FOLLOWING CHAPTERS.

BY PROFESSOR A. G. VOIGT, D.D.

A scholarly Jewish rabbi, with whom I was on friendly terms, used to say that he did not regard Moses as the author of Genesis, but as in an edition of Shakespeare's works a life of the dramatist is prefixed, so Genesis is prefixed to the Law. This ingenious theory hardly merits acceptance, but it brings out an element of truth. Genesis was written as an introduction to the Mosaic Law that follows. It is not an independent account of the early history of the world. It is an account written from the point of view of the law and the establishment of the Mosaic institutions. It is not, as my Hebrew friend supposed, something prefixed; it is a constitutive part of the Pentateuch. The principles and institutions of the people of Israel are shown to have their foundation and corroboration in the history of the world, as directed by God, from the beginning.

The election of the people of Israel was for the purpose of preparing a people of God, holy and righteous. The Mosaic law was designed to train Israel in righteousness and holiness. This implied the knowledge of good and evil, and the distinction between those who are sons of God and who are children of evil. The earliest history of the world is therefore described so as to show the origin and progress of sin among men and the curse which it brings. It is described so as to show that God is not the author of sin, but that He hates and punishes it. Accordingly Genesis I shows how God made the world "good, very good," and Genesis II-IV shows how sin came among men and rapidly developed, with an indication of the two classes of men, the Cainites and Sethites, the children of the world among whom is sin, violence and crime, and the sons of God.

If Genesis I is viewed merely as a cosmogory the purpose of the author of the book is misunderstood. The Hebrews were not interested in physical science as such. The story of the creation is told with a purpose, and that purpose is closely connected in

the mind of the writer with the purpose for which Genesis II-IV was written. The connection is not merely external, it is not merely chronological; it is a connection of ideas; it is the connection of the contrast between the principles of good and evil in their beginnings, between the opposing principles which govern the subsequent history of the human race.

The story of creation, Genesis I-II, 4, is arranged in a scheme of seven days. This is so striking that other points of view in the religious mind of the writer are apt to be overshadowed by it, when the account is now read, especially if the reading be not continuous into the chapters that follow. But this scheme of seven days is itself noted on account of its religious significance. It is designed to show the basis of the Sabbath, as is expressly indicated at the close of the account, Genesis II, 2, 3. The same truth is taken up in the Decalog, Exodus XX, 11. The principle of God's order of work in the world is made regulative for the life of Israel as God's people.

The scheme of six days of God's working is put upon the creation story as an external frame. If the recurring sentence, "And there was evening," etc., is omitted from the account, it remains essentially intact. If the writer indeed used an older document for his account, it might even appear as if he had set the framework of the six days around it in order to show the basis for the Sabbath in God's work of creation. I do not believe this is the case. I believe the writer had thoroughly assimilated his information, wherever he obtained it, and told his story in his own way. But the temporary averting of the attention from the scheme of the six days followed by the rest day, will be helpful to note more clearly other features in the account, which to the writer must have been of great religious significance.

If instead of days the introductory formula, "And God said," be followed to note the separate works of God, it will be found that there are eight great works. I do not think there is any significance in the number eight. But there is significance in the fact that God works by His word. "By the word of Jehovah were the heavens made," Ps. 33, 6; and of course the same is true of the earth and what God has made in it. Israel was bound to the word of Jehovah. In it alone was safety, salvation and life for them. This principle pervades the whole Mosaic system. So in the garden the first man's safety and life were

bound to the observance of God's word. God's word is His instrument of life. By it the Spirit of God works His life-giving effects.

Equally significant as this recurring phrase is the repeated: "And God saw that it was good." Finally, when God surveys all that He made, it is pronounced "very good." As the Israelites knew the world it was not very good, it was not even good. "Few and evil have been the days of the years of my life." Such was the testimony of the aged Jacob and the experience of all who were of Israel. The world might not feel it so much. They of the world might take it as a matter of course that there was evil in the world. But the sons of God could not take evil as a matter of course. It could not be the work of Jehovah, their God. It came from the enemy. God's work from the beginning showed that it was so. But with this point of view in mind the writer of Genesis necessarily had to place the story of the origin of sin and of the curse alongside of the story of the good creation.

And is there not some significance in the contrasts in the successive works of creation? The six days are manifestly divided into two sets of three with a general correspondence: in the first set, light and darkness, waters beneath and above the firmament, dry land and seas; and correspondingly in the second set, lights in the firmament for day and night, water creatures and birds of the heaven, beasts of the earth and man in God's image. It would doubtless be fanciful to find some hidden meaning suggested in all of these contrasts and correspondences. But that some of them are suggestive of larger relations and general principles of Hebrew thought appears to me beyond question. Two of them the purpose of this paper requires to be noticed. There is first the contrast between light and darkness. Of the former it is said: "God saw the light, that it was good." It is not said of the darkness that it was good. It is not even said that God made the darkness. The darkness was there before, as an element of chaos. I would not be misunderstood in what I say. I am far from implying that darkness owes its existence to some principle opposed to God. The Hebrew mind referred everything to the causality of God. "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am Jehovah, that doeth all these things." Is. 45, 7. But to the Hebrew mind darkness was associated with death, with evil, with sin, even as

in the beginning of Genesis it is associated with chaos. Light is the element of life.

Again the contrast between the land animals, which are purely of the earth, and man in the image of God, created to have dominion over them and the birds and the fishes, certainly carries with it the thought that while man is of the earth, he is not altogether of the earth. He is akin to God, a son of God. His fellowship is not with the beasts, but with Jehovah. As God is Lord of All, so man is in place of God, a lord over other living things upon earth.

Man is the end of the entire creation, and it is from man as a center that the whole work of creation is described. For the Hebrew thinker man is the religious being. His religion is his truest life. So creation is viewed from the religious point of view. At the center of all created things it presents man, standing near to God, living in the fellowship of God.

Genesis I-II, 3 describes the world as God made it: filled with light and life, in its goodness reflecting the goodness of God, and blessed in the enjoyment of its Sabbath rest. Soon all become different. How this came to pass is described in the next section, beginning with chapter II, 4. Surely in writing the book the author had in mind the great contrast between the two sections, and even while he was writing chapter I he was looking forward to what he was about to write in chapter III.

The subject of the entire section, Genesis II, 4-IV, is the marring of God's good work of creation, the origin and rapid progress of sin. In this section chapter II must not be viewed as an independent composition. It is the necessary introduction to the main story told in chapters III and IV.

Students of the Bible, who accept the pentateuchal analysis now in vogue, generally regard chapter II as another account of creation; moreover, an account that conflicts with that in chapter I. I am unable to see it in that light. I do not think this is due to obtuseness. I am certain it is not due to any prejudice against a documentary analysis of the books of the Bible. The critical habit itself produces a bias. When a man is looking for differences and divergencies and contradictions as evidence of different documents, he is in great danger of making them where they really do not exist. It seems to me that we ought to credit the man, who had intellect enough to write, or, if you will, to

compile the Pentateuch, with sufficient sagacity to see the flagrant contradictions which critics attribute to him, if they really existed. For instance, if indeed, as the critics maintain, there are two divergent accounts of creation, in the first of which the order is, vegetation, animals, man, and in the second, man, vegetation, animals, the writer or compiler must have been a man of very dull mind not to have seen the contradiction and by a slight alteration in his narrative to have smoothed it out.

Genesis II is really not an account of creation. It is the introduction to the story of the origin of sin and of the evil with which the earth is cursed. As such it describes the scene in which, and the conditions under which the fall of the first man into sin occurred. Chapter II, 4-17 describes the habitation of man and his position in it; verses 18-25 describes the companionship of man with his own kind in this habitation.

The words in chapter II, 4, might seem to introduce an account of creation. "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created." But the word "generations," which is repeatedly used in Genesis in the same way, does not denote origin, but story or history. It presupposes origin. It cannot be denied that the creation of some things (by no means all things) is referred to in this chapter, but the reference is incidental to another purpose. One erroneous idea that confirms those who believe this is a second creation story, diverse from the first, is the emphasis of the supposed chronological order. Even in chapter I the chronological order may be overemphasized. It is indeed noted in the account of creation, but it is not the only nor even the commanding point of view in the creation story. It serves chiefly to establish the Sabbath as a creational ordinance. In chapter II no notice is taken of days. The chronological point of view is left out. The writer refers to the creation of some things as he comes to them in his narrative of the habitation of man.

In verse 5 the writer describes the condition of the earth in contrast with the habitation, which he afterwards describes. Note the specific reference to non-habitableness: "There was not a man to till the ground." Then, about to describe the placing of man in his habitation, the writer stops to tell of the creation of man. Then he proceeds to tell of the placing of man in his

habitation, verse 8. Certainly he must first tell of the existence of the habitation: so he pauses to tell of the creation of the "garden in Eden." Then follows the description of the habitation in detail, including its geographical location, as God made it, after which he narrates what man was to do there, verse 15. After this follows the command in reference to the forbidden tree with a manifest outlook to the incoming of sin through the violation of this command. Surely in this narrative so far we have the background for the story of the fall, of the cursed condition of the earth with the exclusion of man from Eden, and of the rapid extension and increase of sin in Cain and Lamech.

But the story of the fall requires an account of man's previous relation to her, who was his companion in sin and the occasion of his sin. So we have the description of the divine institution of marriage and its pristine purity and innocence. This makes it necessary to tell of the peculiar creation of woman; and this again of the failure of man to find companionship in the animals, whose nature he showed knowledge of by giving them names. As the writer is about to tell of man's meeting with the animals, he stops to tell of their creation, not, I think, without an allusion by contrast in the words "out of the ground," verse 19, to their diversity from human kind.

In reading the story refuses to rest at the close of chapter II. It is carried forward to the crisis in the description of the fall, to the climax in the curse pronounced and the expulsion from the garden, bringing about a condition of the earth in such dreadful contrast to its first condition of Sabbath rest, goodness and light as depicted in chapter I; and then thought is made to linger on the awful extensive and intensive growth of sin, marked by the crime of Cain and the fiercer criminality of Lamech. It is the story not only of a fallen world, but also of a falling world, and the catastrophe of the deluge already looms up on the horizon.

The horror of great darkness, which hangs over the narrative, is relieved by a few consolatory touches. Even after the entrance of sin and the curse good remains. The institution of the Sabbath with its promise of rest continues; the sanctity of marriage with its comforts and its check upon wild desire remains; the repentance of Adam is indicated; above all the promise of the seed that should bruise the serpent's head is made man's posses-

sion; and the beginning of the seed which should wage enmity against the serpent's seed is already noted in the birth of Seth. Men have begun to worship God as Jehovah, the covenant God. With this event the second section of the Genesis narrative terminates at the close of the fourth chapter.

Mt. Pleasant, S. C.

ARTICLE IX.

"EVOLUTION UP-TO-DATE."

BY REV. C. ROLLIN SHERCK.

A half century has rolled by since Charles Darwin first gave to the world his views on the origin of species. The theory of descent, however, had been postulated by various writers on naturalistic subjects through many centuries as has been admirably shown by Professor Osborn in his excellent book, *"From the Greeks to Darwin,"*—but it cannot be said that the theory took fast hold of the scientific world until Darwin published in 1859 his now famous work, *"The Origin of Species."*

Instantly the theory of descent became popular, particularly with that large class of scientists who had felt the galling restraints of theology and philosophy, and the slow progress of scientific thought. Biological science needed a new point of view and Darwin seemed to furnish it in his theory of species-forming through "Natural Selection." It is doubtful if Darwin could have succeeded in popularizing his theory if he had not had such a powerful champion at his back as Thomas Huxley, who, although himself not a great biologist in the strict sense of the word, nevertheless as a naturalistic philosopher in search of a clue by which to account for the origin of species and possibly the origin of life itself, he grasped at Darwin's postulates, incorporated them into his philosophy and popularized them among the working classes of England and America.

No small amount of this sudden popularity of which we are speaking, was due to Ernst Haeckel, that intrepid Darwinian champion, who for almost half a century has stood alone and apart from all the scientists of Europe, as the great exponent and champion of the Darwinian principles,— even going far beyond Darwin in extending these principles throughout the whole organic and inorganic world, applying them to Sociology, Ethics, Politics and Religion, and indeed to every activity of man. It is a very grave question, however, if Haeckel's overzealousness, in pushing too far these assumptions, has not over-

shot the mark, and caused the present reaction, which is so apparent, and to the Darwinians, most painful.

The battle was fast and furious between the champions of Darwinism and the theologians and philosophers during the third quarter of the last century, and as we read their arguments now, in cold type, I think we must concede that the scientists held the whip-hand of the argument and came off the field of battle with laurels. The difficulty as we must view it to-day, was, that neither stood upon common ground. The theologians and idealist philosophers, were contending against the theory of descent per se or what might better express it, "organic evolution," including both organic and inorganic, while the scientists were seeking to vindicate the purely Darwinian factors, of "Natural Selection," "Sexual Selection," and "Pangenesis," and the implied "struggle for existence," by which to account for the origin of species. The scientists apparently gained the day and somehow it has come to pass that the thinking world, particularly the scientific world, settled down to the conviction that Darwinism was no longer a mere hypothesis, that needed to be proved and that in consequence, organic evolution had become a demonstrated fact, not to be seriously questioned; that if species had originated from common ancestors, it logically followed that Darwin had hit upon the correct solution of an otherwise insoluble riddle. For more than forty years the scientific, and we might add, the lay world, following the lead of scientists, has been thinking in terms of an evolutional philosophy. How this is seen in other fields than purely natural science, will appear presently.

THE STATUS OF DARWIN TO-DAY.

Perhaps it will help us to clear the discussion somewhat by a consideration of the status of Darwinism at the present time. I have already alluded to those specific factors of the Darwinian hypothesis, by means of which the theory at once became popular. "Natural Selection" was the Allmacht with him in his work on "The Origin of Species," but in his later work on "The Descent of Man," published in 1871, he shifted the emphasis to "Sexual Selection." The term, "The survival of the fittest," he borrowed from Herbert Spencer, and only used it as synonymous with

"Natural Selection." About this same time, finding Natural Selection inadequate to explain completely all variations in species, he proposed "Pangenesis," against a stout protest from Huxley. Later in life, he called this new theory "Unfortunate."

A careful study of all of Darwin's writings, including his correspondence, will convince the reader that Darwin played fast and loose with his theory of "Natural Selection," and that whenever he found it inadequate to explain all the facts of observation, he fell back upon Lamarckian factor of the "Inheritance of acquired character." Nowhere does this fact appear more clearly than in his "Descent of Man." Many of his conscientious followers took no note of this, but went to work in field and laboratory, to demonstrate the truth of the hypothesis. Of course, natural selection could not operate except through an intense and merciless struggle for existence and the more intense and merciless the struggle, the more operative became the selecting. It should be said, however, in everlasting praise of the great man in whose brain the scheme originated (Wallace always to be included with him), that he always spoke in reverent tones, and there was in his constitutional make-up, a poetic imagination, from which he was never quite free, which more or less colored all of his speculations, and gave them a plausibility that was all compelling. He firmly believed that this was God's way of bringing the organic world into being, including man, and it is quite possible that he could never quite convince himself that if this were true the method would or could cast any discredit upon man the rational soul, provided God were behind the scheme. Of this, we shall speak later.

Darwinism has now been on trial more than fifty years. How is it regarded by the biologists of standing and whose opinions are worth while considering? It is somewhat sad to relate that, Darwinism is cast down in the house of its friends. To be sure there are a few great names of working scientists, in Europe and America, who still adhere more or less tenaciously to the purely Darwinian factors, such as Weismann, and Haeckel in Europe, Poulton, Lloyd Morgan and Ray Lankester in England, Osborn and Baldwin, Wilson and Kellog and David Starr Jordan in this country. These are not amateurs, but scientists of the first rank. We hasten to say, however, that none of our American scientists is a stickler for the purely Darwinian factors, to the utter ex-

clusion of other factors, but they still consider them as having much influence in species-forming. There are lesser luminaries in the biological field, who, while they have not totally discarded the Darwinian factors, have felt the necessity of offering various substitutionary theories to account for variation in species. But the sad fact is yet to be told that there is a growing army of scientists, including the most conspicuous zoologists, botanists, biologists and naturalists, both in Europe and America who have all but entirely discarded every Darwinian factor, as exercising any control at all in the variation of species. Some very intemperate literature is being placed upon the market, particularly in Germany, that land of universities and scientific men, with such striking headlines as the following by Dennert,—"Vom Sterbelager des Darwinismus,"—"At the deathbed of Darwinism, etc." Indeed the reaction has become so intense in some quarters of Germany, that it is not uncommon to read that Darwinism has put back the science of biology fifty years, and has thrown the whole scientific world off the track. It should be observed however, that this intense and at times acrimonious opposition, comes from the brainiest scientists on the continent, and not from the theological or philosophical camp, at all. This makes the situation all the more critical and alarming to a layman.

It may be stated, without fear of successful contradiction, that the biologists are hopelessly divided among themselves upon the main point as to what are the chief factors in species-forming. It should be kept clearly in mind that all of them, so far as our observation goes, with the exception of Fleischman and Hertwig, still strongly and tenaciously adhere to the general theory of organic evolution, although they are divided upon the chief factors in the process. Professor Karl Pearson, a thoroughgoing evolutionist, declares that "Darwinism can explain no more than the fringe of evolution." Fleischman of Erlangen, maintains that Darwinism has not a single fact to sustain it, and that it is "purely a product of the imagination." Prof. G. Henslow of Oxford, says, that "during the past fifty years and up to the present time, it is an indisputable fact, that not a single variety or species of any wild animal or plant has ever been found to have had its origin by means of Natural Selection." These are representative scientists. We might adduce other witnesses in sup-

port of our contention, but they would all speak the same language,—the utter inadequacy of the purely Darwinian factors to account for variation in species. Darwin is said to have brought together more than 30,000 facts in support of his theory, —facts and observations from many lands and by many observers,—yet it cannot be denied that he relied altogether too much upon "artificial selection," for evidence to support his hypothesis. During the last twenty-five years biologists and zoologists and botanists have turned their attention from nature, that is, wild nature, to field and garden and have been experimenting and through their experimentations, have found, to their astonishment, that the purely Darwinian factors would not apply and could not be applied, and have found them unsatisfying. Strange that it never occurred to Darwin, when bringing forward his artificial facts in support of his theory, that he was doing just what the teleologist said God was doing in nature; making the whole scheme purposive. This was Darwin's weakness.

Darwin's theory is preeminently a theory of adaption. If it isn't this, it isn't anything. But "Natural Selection" according to his own statement, is able to explain only adaptive characters. We have shown that most scientists to-day contend that it won't even do this. But there are numberless non-adaptive characters. What are we to do with these and how shall they be explained? On this rock Darwin himself admitted very frankly, that he feared his theory would be wrecked. And many scientists are free to admit that it has been. Natural Selection might explain the non-survival of the unfit, in the struggle for existence, but it cannot explain the arrival of the fit.

Again biologists have found fault with the theory on the ground that it necessitated a struggle for existence, such as has not been found to exist in nature anywhere. That there has been some form of struggle, either for food or reproduction, is not denied, but the intensity of which, as must be assumed on the Darwinian basis, is stoutly denied. Herbert Spencer inveighed most strongly against this view of struggle and it must be admitted that his keen logic and analysis all but destroyed Darwin's contention.

We cannot enter into an exhaustive analysis of the many objections that have been brought against the theory. Those of you who are interested, or have been interested in the current

discussions, may find them fully stated, if you have not already found them, in such books as "Evolution and Adaption" by Prof. T. H. Morgan, "Darwinism of To-day," by Prof. Vernon Kellog of Leland Stanford University, and in magazines. There is a plethora of literature on the subject, much of which has not as yet been translated into English. What is of greater interest to us for the moment, is the fact that many alternative theories have been offered to account for variation in species.

Weismann, of Freiburg University, that loyal champion of Darwinism, feeling himself somewhat dissatisfied with his own work in applying the Darwinian factors, has recently brought forward a new theory of his own, which he calls the "Germplasm theory," or "Germinal Selection Theory,"—which in truth is nothing more than a preformation theory according to which each specific cell has been given its own peculiar function and it can perform none other. But Oscar Hertwig, of Berlin, has practically exploded this theory in his book, "The Biological Problems of To-Day," and his "Epigenesis." Hertwig, and with him, Roux, Naegeli, De Vries, Eimer of Tubingen, and others, contended for what is known as "Epigenesis" or the theory that "the formation of a new individual is not the mere outgrowing of particles hidden in the egg-cell, but the result of moulding external forces." DeVries, from his observations of the Evening Primrose, has proposed his "Mutationstheorie." Many botanists and biologists are leaning somewhat more toward the Lamarckian factor of the inheritance of acquired characters, the factor championed by Herbert Spencer and upon which he staked his reputation as a scientist, by declaring that "if evolution has not come by the inheritance of acquired characters, than evolution is not a fact."

There are no less than one hundred so-called substitutionary theories, or supporting theories to Darwinism, and from careful perusal of them, one is led to wonder where will it all end, and especially what must be thought of any theory that needs so many supports to hold it up. A boy once took his shoes to the shoemaker to have them repaired. After the old man looked them over carefully, he said that they needed new soles and uppers, but that the strings were still good. Prof. Borden P. Bowne, gives even a better illustration in the case of the boy's knife, that had three new handles and five new blades, but it was

the same old knife. Darwinism has been so bandied about and haggled to pieces by the scientists themselves, that it is really a Chinese puzzle to unravel and separate and tell just what is left.

But it should be kept clearly in mind that inspite of all of this unrest among our friends, the scientists, and the unsettled condition of the biological world, all scientists, almost to a man, propose to solve the problem without the aid of teleology, or final cause. The cry now is, back to the cell. Study the beginnings of variation. Here it is hoped the key will be found that will unlock this great and profound mystery. Be that as it may, it is a well known fact that cytology, ontology and empryology, while comparatively recent sciences, and have been pursued with relentless eagerness, have not produced the results that were hoped for. It was thought that an intensive study of the cell, would yield the desired results. And we have such able cytologists, as Oscar and Richard Hertwig of Berlin, and Prof. Wilson of Columbia University, who have given their undivided attention to this work, but the mystery is still as deep as ever. Weismann's theory of cell life is pure speculation and is not looked upon with much favor by others working in the same field. Huxley, earlier, thought that if he could only hide behind a big word like "Bathybius," or sea ooze, he had found the sine qua non of the solution. Haeckel is absolutely certain that all life begins unicellularly, possibly by a chemico-physical process, because, forsooth, it has been found that unfertilized eggs can be made to develop, by applying magnesium chloride. It is awfully simple with him, and his manner of accounting of it almost takes one's breath away.

While it can be affirmed with adequate proof, furnished by the scientists themselves, that "Natural Selection" has been found inadequate to explain many of the variations, yet what strikes the careful observer is, that no substitutionary theory has found ready acceptance among all biologists. Spencer found the Lamarckian factor all-controlling and built his principles of biology upon it. Many biologists to-day are not counting upon this factor to help them out of the difficulty. They contend that it has but a negligible influence in species-transforming. Prof. Osborn strongly inclines to the De Vriesian Mutations theorie, but at the same time is free to confess that "variation is produced

by laws as yet unknown," and adds, "the beginning of new characters is at once the central problem and the most mysterious problem of evolution." Osborn is very strong in his conviction as a paleontologist, that palentology powerfully inveighs against Darwin's assumption of fortuitious variation and strongly supports determinant variation. And there you are. We will have to let these experts fight it out among themselves.

THE EFFECT IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

We presume that few ministers are deeply interested in biological research, and are rather content to leave the work in the hands of competent investigators. But while this may be true, yet it cannot be denied that biological investigations and conclusions or deductions therefrom, have powerfully influenced our thought in other departments of knowledge. These deductions have been carried over into other fields and have borne their legitimate fruit. Sociology no less than religion has caught the drift of thought and sought to apply the principles of evolution. What some of our scientists complain of, is that religion has been altogether too slow in getting the habit of thinking evolutionally. President G. Stanley Hall, of Clark University, complains bitterly that "Religion seems of late to be becoming strangely docile to all the too little we have to teach it." Haeckel, that out and out atheist, or better perhaps, materialistic monist, rails at religion and the Church and only wishes that he had a weapon big enough to smite them both between the eyes and put them out of commission. This is abundantly evident in his "Last Words on Evolution." But what has our distinguished countryman, Dr. G. Stanley Hall got to say about the origin of the soul? In his Baltimore address one year ago, before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and published in a book called "Fifty Years of Darwinism,"—he openly affirms, that "some of us are already convinced that the human soul in all of its power, is just as much the product of evolution, as the body," and then adds this plaintive note,—"but our faith needs to add the knowledge that can only come when all the data are properly grouped." Is it any wonder that religionists have utterly refused to follow the lead of such men until they have furnished better proof of their leadership and right to lead? Dr.

Hall complains against the physicists and physiologists, because forsooth, they have not been swept off their feet into his band-wagon. He tells us in his pleading way that comparatively few psychologists are evolutionists in the strict use of that term, and have made very little use of the results of biology. Doubtless there is a reason for not following his lead, for he has built up his beautiful structure in his ponderous book on "Adolescence" upon the "Mullerian recapitulation theory," a theory almost entirely discredited by leading biologists. He enters a complaint against Wundt, because he approaches psychology from the standpoint of physics and physiology, and he says that his great text-book would have been very little different if Darwin had never lived.

DRUMMOND.

We meet with very strange incongruities in Henry Drummond's "Ascent of Man," in which the effort was made to apply the conclusions of biology in a higher sphere. Drummond's attempt is all the more pathetic because in some essential particulars he built his structure on some of the unproved parts of biological evolution. As a modified Darwinian evolutionist, he sought to graft onto the old stock of the struggle for existence, that new postulate of the struggle for others. When he came to develop his thesis on the emergence of rationality, he was led, as John Fiske likewise was, to assert that physical evolution had ceased as to man's body and turned its attention to the evolution of mind. This break in the continuity, constitutes the fatal weakness of the theory which adopts it. Doubtless thousands have read and regard that most fascinating book and never discovered this all but fatal defect. Of course, it is quite possible to conceive that mind did at some time emerge in the evolving process, but not upon Darwin's fortuitous basis, without doing great violence to the dignity of the innate moral sense of man and affirming with Wallace, upon purely naturalistic basis, that "reason emerged just as soon as it became sufficient in amount to control a greater advantage in the struggle than any physical superiority." Even Huxley as late as 1893, two years before his death, felt obliged to admit in his Romanes lecture, that evolutional science had done practically nothing for Ethics, and that

"men become ethical only as they set themselves resolutely against the evolutional processes of the animal world." This is an admission hardly to be expected from such a quarter. But not all evolutional sociologists and philosophers were as quick to make this discovery and candid enough to acknowledge it, as was Huxley. It has proved a snare to many of them and constituted a fatal weakness in their systems,—particularly to all who were unwilling to rise but little above a materialistic scheme of things. In Leslie Stephen's otherwise admirable book,—"The Science of Ethics," his whole moral world lies at the benevolent mercy of chance and he persistently confounds ethical concepts with animal sympathy,—if in truth there be such a thing as animal sympathy, a fact to be very much doubted. We shall come to this subject presently and in a very aggravated form in Herbert Spencer.

We referred a moment ago to John Fiske,—a charming writer who has inspired many a reader by his pleasing and captivating manner of handling great themes, particularly the subject of evolutional philosophy. To him, all nature was redolent with infinite benevolence. He was essentially a Darwinian evolutionist and there never appeared in his mind any incongruity between Darwin's intensest struggle for existence and his belief in "the cosmic roots of love" pervading everything. Without doubt Fiske powerfully influenced the thought of his age.

Dr. Lyman Abbott essayed to set forth his views, as to how evolution might be applied to Christian theology in his book, "The Theology of an Evolutionist." At the time it appeared from the press, we read it and have since re-read it several times, and our last reading has not altered our views. Perhaps it will be considered special pleading and not germane to the subject to obtrude them here, but it cannot be doubted by anyone who has taken the pains, laborious and tiresome though they be, to think a scheme through to its logical conclusions, that Dr. Abbott's handling of the great themes of Christian theology must seem rather inadequate and inconclusive to many minds. The evolutionary hypothesis has been applied in the sphere of sociology, and with varying degrees of success, according to the standpoint of each writer. The most striking book of recent years, is Benjamin Kidd's "Social Evolution." This versatile writer owed much more to Weismann than he is perhaps willing to credit.

and strange to say his whole scheme is built upon Weismann's unproved and as most scientists affirm, undemonstrable assumptions, because they lie in a sphere where science cannot enter. Weismann postulated that where progress had ceased retrogression became inevitable, and he frequently confounded progress with evolution, two facts never to be confounded. And Kidd concluded that if retrogression were a demonstrable fact, then no rational sanction could be found anywhere for progress. A very keen analysis of his book may be found in Mackintosh's book, "From Comte to Benjamin Kidd." With all the facts before him, it must be admitted that Kidd failed because he did not sufficiently recognize and allow for the mandates of the moral consciousness, or to say the least, placed too low a value upon its moral behests. "Scientific sociology is still a hope, rather than a fact."

A WORD AS TO COSMIC EVOLUTION.

It was the hope of Herbert Spencer, that he would be able to complete his great work, "A System of Synthetic Philosophy." Much illness often delayed his work, and at one time he was so thoroughly convinced that his health would not permit its completion that he prepared his "Data of Ethics" out of its logical order. Spencer's scheme must be regarded the most comprehensive of any as yet proposed, for it was cosmical in its sweep and scope. The boldness of his undertaking and the confident assurances with which he pursued his task, assured him at once an attentive following. It was then believed by many earnest minds, that Spencer, building largely upon the labors of others, would be able to build a philosophical structure that should reach to the skies, be all comprehensive in its character and "final." But strange to relate, the fundamental principle upon which he built his "Principles of Biology," has been all but completely discredited by most living biologists. His Lamarckian factor, of "the inheritance of acquired characters," is now considered a negligible factor in species-forming. The same adverse criticisms may be applied to his "Data of Ethics." In his "Principles of Morality," in which he develops his ideas of religion, he is sure that the idea of a Supreme Being had its origin in the dreams of the savage. The savage first saw his dead ancestor, in

a dream, and from this he was led to postulate spirits and finally a supreme spirit. It would hardly be correct to say, as some have, that "Spencer's God, had been evolved from a dream," but it virtually amounts to this when his process of reasoning is carefully analyzed. In other departments of his great scheme, Spencer was equally unfortunate, because his conclusions or deductions, seemed and do now seem, inadequate to account for all the facts. And after all is not this the supreme problem in any scheme? What is of interest to us here is, that long before Spencer died, he was made painfully aware of the fact that the accumulated scientific thought of his age, had passed beyond his premises, thus rendering his great system practically obsolete before his death. In the vast sweep of Spencer's mind as it surveyed the cosmical universe, it never occurred to him that there were chasms to be bridged between the organic and inorganic world. Matter and force became the nexus. Chemical affinities somehow, not to be defined, fortuitously originated life, and the thing was explained. What has always proved a stumbling block to many minds, especially to all nontelic, is not that different kinds of life emerged in this evolutional process, but that just certain kinds of life came just when needed. Mind also emerged, just when the world was best fitted for it. At this point there is a parting of the ways of the idealistic philosophers and theologians and materialistic evolutionists, and it would appear impossible for them to get together again. If the universe has been evolved in this great cosmic process, the organic and inorganic included, including mind, our idealists declare that God cannot be a personal God, and man can possess no moral freedom. That is to say, if all of man or mind has been evolved. And this is the position of our friend Dr. G. Stanley Hall and others. Many theologians and ministers have not been able to find any insuperable difficulties in the way of the acceptance of a cosmical evolutional process and have labored to harmonize evolution on this point, with religion and the ethical ideal. We are firmly convinced that harmony is absolutely impossible and that an evolutional philosophy is not by any means the final word. Either science must become telic and theistic, or religion will have to account for itself upon some other basis than now obtains, if harmony is ever to be reached.

The defenders of religion, particularly the greatest minds of

our day, can see no common ground for harmony along present lines. Conservative theology is unwilling to surrender its blood-bought treasures, secured during twenty centuries of struggle. Scientists think that religionists have not made sufficient concessions and taken advantage of their results. This is the position of David Starr Jordan, in a recent book, in which he declared that "In the long run, theology with other forms of philosophy, must adjust itself to harmonize with ascertained truth. The origin of man is not a question of personal preference, nor one to be decided by a majority vote. Looking along the history of human thought, we see the attempt to fasten to Christianity each decaying belief in science. Every failing scientific notion has claimed orthodoxy for itself." But does not this criticism cut both ways? If the results of scientific investigation have been so vacillating in character as to require perpetual adjustment to fit the growing knowledge, can theology be blamed for its tardiness in accepting simply unproved assumptions and questionable hypotheses? We trow not.

No doubt science has had a very wholesome influence upon theological thought, particularly during the past twenty-five years. It has brought much theological speculation down out of the clouds, and rendered it humane and likable and even workable. Science in its own sphere,—and when it has kept itself reasonably there,—has glorified itself and enhanced its usefulness. But when it assumes to transcend its own legitimate province and enter the domain of theology, and philosophy, it has to speak mildly, rendered itself ridiculous. And not to castigate our good friends, the scientists, too much, we feel forced to say that they have not occupied their time wholly to the classification and co-ordination of physical phenomena, but have gone beautifully and tranquilly on speculating as to what ought to be. This fault is no where more in evidence than in Darwin's own writings, unless we except Haeckel and Spencer. This allegation against our scientific friends is now for the first time humbly admitted by them and they are charging much of the immense unsettled condition of the scientific world to this fact. We do not hold this as a brief against them, but we do say, that they should not harshly criticise theologians and idealistic philosophers, for doing a similar thing.

THEISTIC EVOLUTION.

Modern theology has shown a good deal of sympathy with the evolutional hypothesis and in many instances has incorporated such portions of it as seemed to have been verified. A good illustration of this is to be found in Dr. Newman Smyth's book, "Through Science to Faith." Indeed we might go even further and say that modern theological discussions have been powerfully influenced by evolution principles. Upon the basis of a theistic evolution, however, proper distinction must be maintained between evolution as a mere mode and as a cause. It is quite conceivable, upon a theistic basis, that God may have chosen the evolutional process in the creation of a world, with all of its potentalities. Whether or not he did so, remains yet to be proved. Even the ripest thought of the day is still divided upon this point. Certain it is that theistic evolution cannot derive much help from such a definition as Joseph Le Conte postulated, and upon which Lyman Abbott constructed his "Theology of an Evolutionist." His definition is this: "A contiuous progressive change, according to certain laws and by means of resident forces." If this definition is to be all comprehensive and inclusive, it is difficult to see how any distinction is to be made, or can be legitimately made, between physical and psychical phenomena. We may easily see how it could well be applied to the former, but not to the latter, unless there be no distinction. For a "continuous progressive change" does not necessarily imply any distinction or difference in kind. Materialistic evolutionists are free to confess that there is none. Conservative Christian theology is very sure that there is, even if theistic evolution shall ever be demonstrated. It has been thought by some theologians that to postulate a God back of the process would render the scheme intelligible and reasonable, but such a world process ever evolving its own forms in a never-ending becoming, stands in imminent danger of sacrificing personality both in the supposed Creator and man the supreme object of His love. We are not yet ready to sacrifice either, to any scheme however plausible. If the theistic scheme is ever to be fully demonstrated, it must be done in full view of a supersensible moral order and the moral consciousness in man, which responds to it. It has been well said that, the conscience is not to be determined by the method

of its coming, but by what it is "sui generis." With our present knowledge of evolution as a scheme and its limitations, it is difficult to see how such a process is adequate for such a result:—"a result standing apart from the means by a total difference in both their nature and direction." As Dr. Valentine has well observed:—"The actual attempts of evolutional writers to construct an ethical view which shall explain the phenomena of conscience and justify its authority, has added further evidence of the difficulty on this point." This is the crux of the problem, for just as soon as conscience has emerged, it sets itself squarely against the very processes which are supposed to have produced it. Even Huxley late in life, recognized this difficulty in the following language: "The practice of what is ethically best,—what we call goodness or virtue,—involves a course of conduct, which in all respects is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence. In place of ruthless self-assertion, it demands self-restraint, in place of thrusting aside, or treading down all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect, but help his fellows. Its influence is directed, not so much to the survival of the fittest, as to the fitting of as many as possible to survive." If reason or the moral faculty is only a phenomenon and not a noumenon, the difficulty is easily settled. If the later, we have to account for a creative cause, and not merely an effect. The attempts thus far to demonstrate a theistic evolution have not proved very satisfactory. Even idealistic monism has thrown little light upon the problem, because its tendency, thus far, has been to destroy divine and human personality and moral freedom in man.

CONCLUSION.

To return to our starting point, and sum up the various points raised in the paper, we find that the distinctively Darwinian factors of "Natural Selection," "Sexual Selection," and "Pangenesis," are to-day generally discredited, or at any rate, have fallen from their high seat of honor, particularly is this true of "Natural Selection." It is generally admitted by the scientists themselves that too much confidence had been placed in natural selection, as the allmacht and not sufficient recognition given to other equally important and perhaps controlling factors. No

substitutionary theory has thus far taken the field and filled the place occupied so long by natural selection. The "Mutations-theorie," of DeVries is being favored and receiving more attention than formerly. Isolation factors have been emphasized by Jordan, Kellog, Wilson and others as playing no small part in variation. What is of greatest importance, however, is the assertion of Weismann and repeated by others, that "we have no right to assume teleology in a world of natural phenomena." Cosmic evolution even in the skillful hands of Herbert Spencer, has proved unsatisfying, because it is inadequate to explain all of the gaps in the process,—between the organic and inorganic, between matter and mind. As Naegeli has well observed,—"the distance which separates man from the lowest bacterium is far less than the distance between the lowest bacterium and inorganic matter." The attempts to construct a theistic evolution that shall be adequate to the task have not been conspicuous successes, for most of such attempts have either slurred over the great facts of the religious consciousness, the facts of sin and redemption, or have repudiated in part at least, a supersensible moral law, grounded in the nature of things and to which all consciences other than God's must inevitably respond and obey. The pendulum is just now swinging between a materialistic monism and an idealistic or spiritual monism and the contention is made that either horn of this dilemma must at last be accepted. After all, there is comfort in the thought, not that we know so little, but that we are all determined alike to know more.

P. S.—Since the above article was written, (March 2, 1910), the latest book from the press on this subject, "The Making of Species," collaborated by Douglas Dewar and Frank Finn, was placed into my hands, and I am gratified to note their all but unanimous confirmation of every position taken in the first part of this article, which deals with the Darwinian factors. This book is a valuable contribution to the subject and will do much good in clarifying the atmosphere of much biological haze, because it is the combined product of two young men, actually working in the field of investigation and not a product of the laboratory.

Leipsic, O.

ARTICLE X.

PRAGMATISM.

BY THEO. B. STORK, ESQ.

If we were all to treat Philosophy and her questions with the light and airy, almost irresponsible, touch of Mr. William James, perhaps some of the clever retorts that have been made to his theory of Pragmatism would suffice and no more said. We might quote Chesterton's clever dictum, "This Philosophy indeed is a kind of verbal paradox. Pragmatism is a matter of human needs and one of the first of human needs is something more than a Pragmatist," or applying its own test of what is the use of a thing, we might ask, what is the use of Pragmatism? Thus like the asp; it dies of its own sting, and so an end of it. However clever this may seem, it is in matter too superficial; in manner too flippant.

Philosophy, despite all her calumniators and detractors is a serious thing: properly understood, one of the most serious things in our lives. Her questions are not to be thrust aside as of no importance or lightly answered as if it made no matter. Every man is a philosopher, although he may not know it. Every man, perforce, asks her questions and answers them in some fashion and every day. How did we get here; what are we doing; whither are we going? These are not idle conundrums which we may answer or not as we please. We must answer them whether we will or no, not academically, theoretically, but practically and in reality.. Every act of our daily lives is an answer in some fashion, for every act, however trifling apparently, has its place in that great play in which we all have our little part. Each life is a slender thread in the weaving that is far beyond our puny imagining and yet that exacts of us some attempt to understand and follow the pattern of the whole in its completeness.

Philosophy deserving of the name must always be an attempt to put this practical answer which we have to make in deeds into terms satisfactory to our intellect. And so no act is too small to escape her cognizance; nor too great to forbid her scrutiny, for

they are all, small and great, a part of that unknown whole. On her behalf, we might paraphrase Bishop Hooker's magnificent tribute to the Law and declare that Her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the spheres; all things in heaven and in earth are her concern; the greatest as not above, the least, as not beneath her notice. It is a saying of the law that the possessor of a single foot of land in fee simple owns it from deepest hell to highest heaven, and so the doer of the slightest act lays hands upon a living chain of causes and effects that stretches forward and back endlessly into eternity. So much: if so much be necessary, by way of vindication of Philosophy's title to be treated seriously and with a becoming reverence, if not for what she is at any particular time or in any particular form, as for what she seeks and represents in the soul of man. Let us, therefore, examine, with a gravity befitting the subject, the answer which this new Philosophy of Pragmatism offers to the old-time questions. And first it were well to make the preliminary remark that Pragmatism struggles with the great problem of all human philosophy. This is the problem of finding some sure foothold for its lever of thought; some maxims or propositions which defy all attack of the skeptic by which it may test and measure its speculative thinking; some form of thought to which to apply as a final arbiter of the truth or falsity of its reasoning. The search for these is untiring, ceaseless, since the first beginnings of philosophic thinking. It is by the discovery of these that all philosophy has made whatever real progress, it has made in the difficult and devious journey toward truth. These have constituted the treasures of Philosophy. The discovery of one such has been sufficient title to fame. It was the glory of DesCartes that he announced one of them in his "Cogito ergo sum." That was an indisputable verity of thought—a sure foothold for further steps. It meant, if I understand it aright, not any syllogism such as some have endeavored to make of it that all thinking beings exist, I am a thinking being, therefore, etc.; but only this, that my thinking is a mode of my existence; that to know that I think is identical with knowing that I exist directly with no intervention of a reasoning process; a direct piece of knowledge which I can no more doubt than I can doubt my having a sensation when I am actually conscious of it. I am the thinking I am conscious of, that thinking is a mode of existence of myself.

Bishop Berkeley contributed another verity of thought when he pointed out that sensations were all we reallly knew of the external world. Reason as you please, materialist or idealist, there you have a sure unquestionable truth from which to start on your quest after further truth. Others might be added, such as the impossibility of the truth of two mutually contradictory propositions. Nihil ex nihilo fit is another. All thinkers of whatever school or however widely divergent in other respects, must admit, cannot dispute that for human thinking these propositions are verities. Let us not go now into the further and more difficult question whether they are only verities of our thinking, or whether they are in reality and universally true.

Pragmatism undertakes to present us with a new verity of thought of this sort; something that shall solve for us some of the difficulties of our progress toward truth; shall furnish us with another of those few propositions which are beyond the skeptic's cavil, indisputable when understood and a sure test of our further reasoning. It proposes to us a new test of truth and goodness. Putting it as briefly and concisely as possible, Pragmatism lays down the rule; whatever "works well" is good, true and right. That is to say, we have presented to us, by which to test our philosophical theories, what might be called a practical test: for example, we are told to apply this as a test of truth: "If the hypothesis of God works satisfactorily in the widest sense of the word, it is true." And again, "If theological ideas prove to have a value for concrete life, they will be true for Pragmatism in the sense of being good for so much."[1] True is the name of whatever proves itself to be good in the way of belief and good too for definite assignable reasons."[2]

"Her (Pragmatism's) only test of probable truth is what works best in the way of leading us."[3] "We cannot reject any hypothesis if consequences useful to life flow from it."[4]

Truth is to be tested by seeing if the alleged truth works well, would seem to be a fair summing up of the above quotations. Working well would also appear to be the test of goodness in religious questions for we are told: "Pragmatism has to postpone

1 Pragmatism, p. 73.
2 Ibid, p. 76.
3 Ibid, p. 85.
4 Ibid, p. 273

dogmatic answer for we do not yet know certainly what type of religion is going to work best in the long run."[5] Working well as a test of truth forsooth! Here, indeed, is an answer which would have surprised Bacon's jesting Pilate who asked: "What is truth?" and would not stay for an answer.

To define something by the same or an equally indefinite term has always been held, we believe, a fatal logical fault. If truth is what works well, how then are we to know what works well? This seems like getting farther afield than before; we are not getting home, but into a strange and unknown region full of pitfalls and bogs, without finger posts, sign boards, or indeed any roads but rabbit tracks that take us up a tree. To the ordinary man, truth is one of the simplest of philosophic questions; that is true which agrees, copies, faithfully represents some other thing. We use the word in daily life with no other thought and until Pragmatism arose to point out our difficulties we were not aware of any. A true mirror was one which reflected truly what was presented to it, but now a true mirror is one which "works well," perhaps gives me a flattering picture of myself of a morning when I feel ill, and so instead of discouraging me as a true—I beg pardon for I see that under this new light I must now use another word—a correctly reflecting mirror would, the true mirror flatters aand so heartens me for the duties of the day, Some one might perhaps consider that that flattering mirror did not work well, that a mirror which warned me of my ill appearance would work better and so what would be a true mirror to the one would be a false mirror to the other. Truth is then but a matter of opinion; for who can apply this test of working well! Anybody at his good pleasure working well or ill, as the man says in the Comic Opera, are relative terms. It is a matter of opinion and we are now launched on a sea of conjectures where one man's guess is as good as another's and nobody's worth very much. Or perhaps it may be, it certainly ought to be said if Pragmatism makes any pretense to philosophical accuracy, that the working well of a theory or truth or of anything is no uncertain thing depending upon individual opinion; that works well which works best for the individual, the community, the race, the universe as an entirety.

5 Pragmatism, p. 300.

It is reassuring to find that Pragmatism recognizes this requirement. And so we find it protesting against the opposite interpretation of its doctrine as a misconstruction. On this point Mr. James remarks, "Schiller says the truth is that which works." Thereupon he is treated as one who limits verification to the lowest material utilities. Dewey says "Truth is what gives satisfaction." He is treated as one who believes in calling everything true, which, if it were true, would be pleasant."[6]

Pragmatism refuses therefore, as not expressing its true intent to be bound by the test of "working well," meaning by that simply an immediate short-sighted "working well" of the next moment or even the next day or year or for the particular individual considered by himself. We may justly conclude, therefore, that it is the working well for all time and for all things that is the test of truth to which it appeals.

This is indeed the only interpretation of its meaning worthy of the name philosophical. But in making this claim, or rather we might say, this admission of its meaning, for it is a tremendous admission, does it not give up all its boasted merits of practicality, of superiority, to the Rationalist philosophy, against which it inveighs so vigorously? We are now asked to ascertain for our questioned Truth not whether it works well now and here, but whether in the long future ages, whether for unknown universes it works well. Eternity and the universe must be considered before we can say it works well. This is no simple problem, no practical test; on the contrary we find ourselves involved in a complicated and difficult teleological problem. It is as much a question of ultimate purpose, of final ends, as the most extreme Rationalist could imagine. I cannot tell whether a truth works well in this Pragmatical sense, the sense upon which Mr. James insists, unless I know what is the ultimate purpose of all working of all things.

Working well must mean in harmony with that Almighty Power that shapes all created things, and whose purposes we only dimly guess.. So the solution of working well turns out to be nothing more than our old friend final purpose of all things which men have talked and argued about since Socrates and Plato and long before. In other words, working well is no so-

6 Pragmatism, p. 134.

lution at all of a philosophical sort; the definition of working well is no clearer than before by this Pragmatical appeal to it as the absolute test of truth and goodness. Even if the Pragmatist did not concede this, and should say, as apparently he refuses to say, 'I propose no such long and profound inquiry in regard to working well, my idea is simply the practical every day working well which we all know: that adaptation of means to ends of daily life! He would be forced to it, for any other course is impossible to Philosophy: she cannot stop half way. As pointed out in our preliminary remark: she strikes far and deep for the solution of the simplest act. I cannot simply say this medicine works well because it saves my life; I must go on and assume that to save my life is a good thing, not only for myself, but for the universe, and its final purpose. We know very well my life cannot be saved indefinitely; the time may come, nay, must arrive, when it will be best that I should lose my life. Pragmatism to be philosophical therefore must assume that its working well is a working well for that final purpose of all things and must therefore answer, cannot escape answering, that universal question. Sometimes it changes the phraseology of its statement, substituting value or worthiness for "working well." "We add both to the subject and to the predicate part of reality; we build the flux (that is add to it) out inevitably; the great question is, does it, with our additions, rise or fall in value? Are these additions worthy or unworthy?"[7] Here again we are confronted with lack of definition. What constitutes value? How do we measure it? What is the standarad of value or of worthiness? The Epicurean replies "pleasure," and that is a simple standard or measure easy to apply, requiring no explanation. What gives me pleasure is valuable and worthy because it gives me pleasure. Here is an approach to philosophical exactitude or at least certainty, for I know absolutely without shadow of doubt when and how and from what I experience pleasure. We may not agree, we cannot fault this standard for want of definiteness. So "Universal conceptions * * * have indeed no meaning and no reality if they have no use, but if they have any use they have that amount of meaning and the meaning will be true if the use squares well with life's other uses."[8] But what are life's uses; how shall we meas-

7 Pragmatism, pp. 255-6.
8 Ibid, p. 273.

ure their relative value? For the Pragmatist, as well as all other philosophers, must answer this question; until he does so, Pragmatism is as unintelligible as an unknown tongue in the absence of a dictionary. It uses the terms use, value, worth and leaves them undefined, and furnishes us no means of defining them. To one man it may be a useful and worthy thing to kill and eat his fellow; for another, to nurse and succor him; Pragmatism leaves us with no standard and no means of finding one. What is even worse, she confuses and shakes what little we have achieved in the way of definite indisputable verities of thinking.

So much for the contribution of Pragmatism to the treasures of Philosophy; its famous "working well" is not an addition to the acquisitions of the race like "Cogito ergo sum"; that was a true step forward on the devious and difficult path to truth. "Working well" is a confusing, a blurring, of what certainties we have been able to achieve, rather than any help to greater definiteness or fuller certainty. Without knowledge of final purpose by which to test our "working well," a standard that shall measure what is well or ill in the working of man or thing, we are no further advanced than before. It has already been shown that this standard, to have any value, must fix for us the ultimate purpose of all creation and so simply lands us in what the Pragmatist calls the Rationalist's peculiar kingdom where teleology and all the other "ologies" hold undisputed sway.

There is, however, another pretension put forward in behalf of Pragmatism by its exponents and very clearly set forth by Prof. L. P. Jacks,[9] who tells us that the crucial point of James' Polemics lies just here; namely, that the experience as it really is experienced is not the experience of our rationalist theorizing; experience in its continuity, in its experiencing is a very different matter. We discuss experience as though it were a completed, finished something, to which no more is to be added; experience, active and felt as reality by the men living it, is a different thing. How, for example, can we consider that an absolute can contain such a reality as an experience going on and being lived every moment by some living man. For example, take the experience of Trooper Smith, a survivor of the famous Light Brigade, whose experience of that charge was a continuous living experience, filled with keen apprehension every

9 William James and His Message (*Contemporary Review*, January, 1911).

moment that the next might be his last. His experience could not be part of the experience of an Absolute for it would have no apprehension of his death foreseeing perfectly his future life at his fireside years after with his children at his knee. To understand Pragmatism we are told we must think this experience of our Trooper Smith not as a dead cut-and-dried thing extravasated of all red blood of reality, but as it really is, growing and being added to every moment. But that is precisely what is impossible. We cannot think reality; the laws of thinking forbid it; for thinking consists, in its very essence, of the control of its objects, their arrangement in a certain order, their recall or their dismissal at will, all of which is impossible with reality, that being entirely beyond the control of thought. A resort to that much abused and caluminated Rationalism would have told the Pragmatist as much. We know reality in part for the very reason and because it is beyond our control. Reality will not yield itself to the coercions of thought; for what is thinking but the taking up, bit by bit, representations or counters of the minds manufacture and the placing them side by side at our pleasure, comparing, judging their relations to each other, their likeness and differences and passing judgment thereon. Such a process is out of the question with reality; reality is beyond our control; it comes and goes, resists or even coerces us and so we cannot think it, we can only make representations of it and think these which are mere abstractions of it.

It is sufficient to observe in this particular instance the tangle a man falls into the very moment he begins even to attempt this impossible feat of thinking and arguing about reality as such and as distinct from its abstraction, that representation of it which alone is capable of being the object of thought. We are told that the Absolute, the Omniscient, knows all things, and knowing Trooper Smith's experience as an entirety could not have that feeling of apprehension which is part of his experience. If we ask why cannot the Absolute have this, we are told, or rather we are left to infer, that this knowledge of future safety and apprehension of danger are incompatible and self-contradictory. How can the Absolute have this apprehension and knowledge at one and the same time, and if not, why then, of course, the Absolute cannot include in its experience Smith's experience. In other words, they are self contradictory atti-

tudes of mind. Was there ever a more confused jumbling of the laws of thinking with reality? The impossibility of two contradictories, of a negative and an affirmative existing together is a mere impossibility of thinking. The impossibility of contradictories is only a law of thought and amounts to but this, that an affirmative cannot contain a negative.[10] In reality contradictories do exist, sometimes destroy each other, and therefore equal nothing; or possibly one may destroy the other, or both may unite in some new third thing different from either.

But consider what Prof. Jacks has done: he first insists on our thinking reality, that is: Smith's experience as something alive, in process of experiencing; not as a mere representation of thought, which is our only possible way of thinking it. Then he invokes a law applying exclusively to thinking as precluding a certain co-existence of two contradictory realities, to wit: Smith's experience of apprehension and the Absolute's omniscient knowledge that such apprehension is unfounded. We are asked on this reasoning to conclude that in reality such co-existence is impossible because thus forbidden by the laws of thought.

Thus Pragmatism is forced to take refuge, not in its boasted practical test of whether it works well, but in the ideal rationalistic test whether it can be thought, and this applies the principle which Rationalists carefully restrict to its proper sphere of thinking by applying it to a totally alien sphere, that of reality. Can practical Pragmatism go further toward idealism than to thus invoke a principle of pure thinking as a principle applicable to reality? In other words, we find Pragmatism coming back for its verities of thought to the principles and laws of thinking, and we see that it is no better off than other philosophies. It has discovered no new tests even of a practical sort; it despises the rationalist who finds the only possible indisputable test for his judgment of good or ill in the laws of his own thinking; not because he cannot realize its defects but because he recognizes them as the only tests possible for him. "To treat abstract principles as finalities before which our intellects may come to rest in a state of admiring contemplation is a great rationalist failing," we are told in Pragmatism, p. 94. But what else is there for even the Pragmatist but to appeal as the

10 See Kant's Critique of Pure Reason.

final and last resort to these principles which have their only certainty in the thinking faculties of man?

Prof. Jacks tells us in his article, "William James and His Message," that an Absolute which has the experience of our Trooper Smith and the knowledge of his ultimate safety is a sort of monstrosity with no touch of intimacy with mortals, but rather separated by a great gulf fixed between it and them.

But by what standard are we to come to such a conclusion? The standard of our human modes of thinking and feeling, ideal, egotistic standards as far removed from true Pragmatic tests of how things work, from practical affairs, as the idealism of Kant and Berkeley, and certainly as far removed from that reality to which they are mistakenly applied. What then is the lesson of all these Pragmatic strivings after a new test of truth and value founded upon the practical, on the "working well" of the alleged truth. Is it not that all true philosophical progress, slow and uncertain as it must be, has got to be made by studying, not the external world, but the internal? We are forced back upon the study of our own instrument of knowledge, our own mind, and its laws of perception and thinking. This is the one and only object by the investigation of which we can hope for any permanent and valuable results. It is here that all our past substantial gains have been made; our grasp on reality has not been weakened by Bishop Berkeley but rather clarified and strengthened, measured and made intelligible. We have seen that it is our sensations that are our true reality. The functions of our thinking, if not all made clear and plain by Kant, have surely been set in their true place and the path marked out along which all future progress must proceed. While Des Cartes with his epoch making announcement of "Cogito ergo sum" exemplified again the same truth that it is in the study of our own mental processes that alone any true philosophic achievements are to be expected.

Perhaps it were ungracious to take the last step and add that great qualification to all our achievements in this direction that these verities of thinking are only verities for us and for our world of consciousness and thinking. We must accept them as true; we cannot say whether they are universally true or true otherwise than for ourselves.

Philadelphiaa, Pa.

ARTICLE XI.

DOES NATURE MAKE PROGRESS?

BY LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

Now-a-days the idea of evolution seems to have taken a powerful hold on the scientific and popular mind. Even our great ex-president, Mr. Roosevelt, judging from his Oxford address, seems to have accepted the general idea of natural evolution. It is therefore a patent thing to search into the matter, to see whether the natural realm which we know to-day possesses anything like a marked and irresistible tendency to make improvement, to pass from lower to higher forms. Is the law of progression plainly written on nature's pages as we may read them to-day?

None of us would dispute the general evidences of geology. We cannot and will not deny that in the geological ages there was a movement from the lower to the higher stages of existence. First came the oblique forms of life which are obviously vegetable; then the primal forms of animal life; then the higher forms; lastly man himself, like a crown upon the pedestal of creation. That this general law of upward movement prevailed in the remote pre-historic past no one would be so foolish as to deny.

However, two things need to be said about this progressive movement in ante-historic times. First, the general law described is precisely in harmony with the Biblical narrative of creation, which outlines most graphically the process from primeval chaos, when the earth was waste and void, to the beginning of life and up to the finished product, man. Second, geology by no means shows a gradual scale of progress from the lower to the higher types. On the contrary, there are many leaps and gaps, some of them of tremendous width and depth. For instance, when the fishes first appear in the Devonian age, they are perfect fishes, not mere links in a graduated scale in which one form merges into another without leaving a distinguishable line of cleavage. Many of the geological animals were great mastodons as perfect in organism as any animals we have to-day and some of them much more powerful. The first geological man

ever found was, to all intents and purposes, a fully developed human being, physically considered, with a head, as Mr. Huxley said, that might have been the head of a philosopher. Note also the same admission by Mr. Roosevelt in his Oxford address.

Now, it is often said that Bible interpreters change their explanations of the Bible to suit the facts as science discovers them. But Bible men are not the only ones—scientific men do the same thing. Seeing that nature in the geological cycles often made progress by leaps and bounds, the scientists have introduced a new term into their evolution theory—"mutation." And now this term is used for all and more than it is worth, just as the terms, "natural selection" and the "survival of the fittest," have been and still are employed. But no one has stepped forward to tell us why nature makes these tremendous jumps, or where the tendency comes from. Perhaps it is to balk the evolutionists in their desperate efforts to find the "missing links!" Permit me to ask, Does not this disposition of nature to bound along like a great kangaroo rather point to the Bible view of special creations than to the theory of natural evolution? Indeed, is it not illogical to speak about evolution going by prodigious "mutations"? Surely, surely, a big vault from a lower form to a perfect higher form cannot consistently be called evolution. Then why hold on to a term that has become antiquated?

Let us now look at nature as she is to-day and has been since history began. First, we would remark that the Bible tells us that when God had finished the creation, He pronounced it good, ceased creating, and "rested" from His creative work. This would point to a finished work so far as making new things is concerned—a work in which certain fixed laws would dominate; in which there would be reproduction of the types already created, in accordance with the fiat, "Increase and multiply," but in which new and higher forms would not appear. Does not this agree with nature as we know her to-day? Do we see the law of progress written large and plain on nature's domain? Or do we not rather see the law of stability, of persistency of form and type? Which of these laws, we would insist, bulks the more largely and explicitly on the pages of nature's realm?

Looking at nature as we know her since the dawn of history, we find no law of progress clearly stamped upon her operations.

If any new species have been introduced—and it is very doubtful—they have not been higher forms, but the low forms of insect pests. All animals in the natural state are just the same now as they were three and six thousand years ago; the lion still a lion, not an improved breed; the elephant still an elephant; the giraff still the same long-necked beast; and even the monkeys of to-day are precisely the same as those pictured and described in Egypt three or four thousand years ago; no advancement, no progress, no evolution; simply reproduction and the most stubborn persistency of type. Now this is our pointed query: If the law of progress is the primal law of nature, why has it become inoperative since the beginning of human history, since the era when it could be really tested? Surely a law which is made to account for almost everything we have at present in nature ought not to be so elusive to-day. It ought to be writ large and plain.

There are other laws that bulk out on nature's page like raised letters on a tablet. What are some of them? The laws of stability, of persistency and reproduction of type. There they lie on the surface, so that everybody can read as he runs, scientist and layman alike. So far as we know, no distinct species ever cross, or if they do, as in the case of the horse and the mule, the hybrid product becomes sterile—just enough of an apparent exception to establish and emphasize the general rule. Nor is that all. So anxious does nature seem to be to preserve and teach the law of stability of type that, as soon as a humanly cultured breed of animal or kind of fruit or cereal is left to its own way, it begins to revert to its original and inferior form. Let people simply neglect their farms, gardens and orchards for several generations, and see what the result will be. The same would be true if their horses, cattle, sheep and farmyard fowls were neglected. Study nature where you will to-day, you will find the law of change written plainly enough, it is true, but nowhere the law of progress. No; nature left to herself takes no forward steps. Reproduction of species, growth, decay and death, then reproduction again, a ceaseless round. If no new external power touches nature, she will "go on forever," like Tennyson's brook, only to get back time and again to the same point.

"But there is progress in the world!" some one exclaims. Yes;

my friend, there is progress in one realm; but in only one—the human realm, among the race of men. Here in many instances the law of progress is written in bulking letters of gold. Progress, sometimes all too slow, yet clear as the noonday. Though we do not breed a new species of men, we do produce a higher grade of men. Even here the progress is not universal, and, sadly enough, there have been many cases of degeneration. There are heathen peoples that are the same now as they have been from time immemorial, while others have slid backward in the scale of progress. But note, wherever Christian civilization truly touches man, there is advancement. Does not this agree with the Biblical conception of man? Made in the divine image, endowed with mind and soul and therefore with rational powers, he is capable of improvement, yea, of endless progress, by his own initiative and volition, aided by the power and grace of God. Nature is not rational; therefore in and of herself she cannot advance; her own inertia keeps her what and where she is. There is only one thing in all the world that has the divine gift of initiation and self-movement; it is mind with a will.

And mind you, too, that wherever in nature's realm there has been improvement, since the dawn of history, since men have been able to investigate and test, it has come about only through the uplifting touch of human genius. All our blossoming gardens and orchards, all our fertile fields, all our highly developed breeds of fowls and animals, all our multitudinous inventions—which are simply pushing nature beyond herself—bear witness to the advancing faculty of man. Nature never would have made an electric trolley car. She was never intended to do such things; simply to furnish the materials for man's genius to work upon and push to new conquests.

How unmistakable is nature's teaching here! She stands still, waiting for the transforming touch of her master, man. How beautifully this harmonizes with Holy Writ, which tells us that man was created to till the ground and to have dominion over the animal creation! Yes, there is evolution in the world today; but it is found only where there is a rational mind, and even there it becomes really marked and extraordinary only where it is kindled and fostered by the Gospel of Christ and the arts of Christian civilization.

Canal Dover, Ohio.

ARTICLE XII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The Princeton Theological Review for January has an article by Dr. Warfield in which he discusses "The Antiquity and the Unity of the Human Race." The antiquity of the race involves no peculiar theological problem. Neverthelss the biblical story which makes man a comparatively late creation is true. The vast ages which speculative science has demanded for his origin have been reduced by sober investigation to ten or twenty thousand years. This period may be covered by a rational biblical chronology, which has been grossly mistaken by Usher and others. The Old Testament chronological tables are not intended to give a complete record, and are simply an outline of generations. The unity of the race, however, is a theological problem of great importance, for Christ came into the world to save the race of Adam. Happily, this biblicaal doctrine is no longer disputed by science.

The Methodist Review for January in an article by Dr. Warren of the Boston University, on "A Recently Detected Promoter of Vital Piety," ridicules the attitude of the late Prof. James and his school on the existence of "a mysterious agent whose action in the field of religious experience seems only lately to have been discovered." Dr. Cutten, in his recent work on "The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity," gives serious consideration to the imaginary sub-conscious self and to so-called "thought-transference." "It should have occurred to him and to his predecessors," says Dr. Warren, "that space notions do not well apply to spiritual experiences, and that in a being created for the kingdom of heaven, super-conscious sluiceways are quite as thinkable, and quite as predicable, as sub-conscious."

Dr. E. Y. Mullens, President of the Baptist Seminary, Louisville, in the January number of *The Review and Expositor,* discusses "The Modern Issue as to the Person of Jesus Christ."

Was Jesus simply a teacher of religion, or was He also the object of religion? Was He a messenger from God merely, or was He, in and of Himself, a revelation of God also? The article proposes to examine the matter, first, in the light of the historic records; second, of science; third, of philosophy; and fourth, of the question as to rationalism and life. In regard to the first, he finds that historic criticism has absolutely failed in its efforts to eliminate Christ as the God-man. Failing in this hostile criticism, nevertheless, contends that Christology has no place in the synoptic records, but now on philosophic grounds! In the second place while science may properly observe phenomena and deal critically with the records, it can not answer the question as to Jesus in any final or authoritative manner, simply because the question lies beyond its domain. In the third place philosophy is very elusive. The postulates of any theory being admitted its conclusions are inevitable. The present philosophic issue is whether all existence is to be explained on the principle of physical causation or on the principle of personality. Materialism and some forms of pantheism assert the former; idealism, theism and personalism the latter. "Of course, theism is incomparably the strongest of world-views, and theism is wholly compatible with the incarnation and with the Christological elements in the Gospel. But theistic arguments are not coercive to reason, so that when presented to the materialist he is not compelled to accept them, so long as he prefers the materialistic or other world-views. Philosophy therefore, does not attain finality as to the person of Jesus any more than science and criticism." In the three foregoing categories the evangelical view is, to say the least, as respectable as any other, and this is a decided vantage point when it comes to the final test. In the fourth place: The real contest lies between rationalism or logic on the one hand, and voluntarism or life on the other. "Men have been a long time catching up with the teachings of the New Testament. Philosophers for hundreds of years have been pursuing the shadowy forms of truth running on and outstripping them. They have now overtaken the form and looked into its face, and lo, it is the face of the Son of God; He taught the practical voluntarism of modern philosophy two thousand years ago. The way to discover the secret of the universe is to conceive it, not as matter or force or energy, but as a

person. The way to understand that person is to consider Jesus Christ, look at His face and form. The way to test the reality of this personal explanation of being is to act toward it in a voluntaristic and personal way. * * If Jesus should ever fail to respond to the sincere appeal to Him, if men are ever disappointed in Him who approach Him in His own appointed way, then they would be warranted in rejecting Him."

"The Theologian of the Future," is ably discussed in the January *Bibliotheca Sacra,* by Dr. A. A. Berle of Boston.

There are at least five great generalizations of science with which the theologian of the future must be familiar and with which he is asked to be in sympathy.

1. Knowledge can have no personal quality.

2. Nature has and can have no moral interests.

3. The individual has practically no worth in the program of evolution.

4. Spiritual interpretations of natural phenomena have no scientific value .

5. The theistic conception of the universe has no scientific standing.

The question is, "Can a theology be framed, can a religious life be lived, which can in the least recognize the validity of these propositions or most of them? Is it worth while even to try to win the approval of any form of human thought which announces such a set of generalizations? And is it not a vain search to find any *via media* which will lead to peace with them?"

Let us look at some of the fundamental propositions of theology:

1. Theology must assume that knowledge and personality are inseparable.

2. If personality is the ultimate reality, it goes without saying, as a logical necessity, that there is a moral order and purpose in the world.

3. It is one of the absolute necessities of theology that it shall hold that the spiritual message of nature is its ultimate and real message.

4. Again, when we consider the question of the individual—

his worth, his significance, his titular place in the organic and physical world—we have another of these deep, inevitable and bridgeless chasms between the prevailing scientific conceptions and the necessary elements of theological thought.

5. And what is the summation of it all? That the theistic conception which lies at the basis of all theological thought carries with it the whole program of prayer, providence, yes, and as I dare to believe, miracle.

The conclusion is that the theologian need not be particularly concerned to harmonize generalizations, which may after all be far from permanent. Let him follow truth as far as he can, heeding not the raucous cries of arrogance about him, least of all the fine clothes vendors of the cultivated world. Strip them all naked and they all look alike; and when all their artificial distinctions are gone, they are alike the children of sin and sorrow, whose great problem is personal forgiveness and personal reconciliation in the love and peace of God.

Dr. William Adams Brown of Union Seminary, writes of "The Old Theology and The New" in the *Harvard Theological Review* for January. By the old theology is meant that type which ignores the modern scientific movement and its results. By the new theology is meant the converse of the old in reference to scientific progress. For the sake of illustration Calvinism is taken as a typical representative of the old theology. Arminianism or Anglicism might also be taken. The fundamental lines remain the same. In each case we face the same antithesis between law and grace, natural and the supernatural, the human and the divine. There is no place for toleration or compromise. We deal in absolute antitheses, realities that have remained unchanged from the beginning. The conception of development, of growth, of adaptation, of progress, are unknown.

To understand and to put the right valuation on this old theology three questions must be asked and answered. First, where did this theology come from? Secondly, what gave it its power over the men who held it? And thirdly, why is it no longer satisfying to-day?

In answer to the question, where did the old theology come from, it may be said that its origin has three strands: (1) The

Christian element, preserved in Catholicism and inherited by Protestantism from it, such as the importance of the Old Testament as a source of revelation, the central place given to Jesus, the conception of God as a God of grace, &c. (2) The elements which Protestantism shared with Catholicism, such as the dualistic view of the world, conception of freedom as arbitrary choice, total depravity and original sin, verbal inspiration, imputation of merit as a mathematical equivalent. (3) The elements representing the reaction of Protestantism against Catholicism, such as the right of private judgment, the Bible as sole authority over against tradition, the priesthood of believers and a common ethical standard for layman and minister.

The second question has to do with the causes which give the old theology its hold. The answer is found in the living experience from which it springs and of which it is the expression. It is more than a mere system of doctrine, it stands for conviction and life, and produced great men.

"But if the old theology contains so much that is true and life-giving, why is it no longer satisfactory to-day?" Why do we need a new theology, especially in view of an apparent lack of official standards and agreements in the latter? But the lack of agreement is more apparent than real. The first and most striking characteristic of the new theology is its view of the world as a unity. The contrast between nature and the supernatural has disappeared. Life is all a piece. The universe is one, governed by the same law. This law is one of development. Growth characterizes every living thing. Nature and the supernatural are not two different kinds of reality, but two aspects of one reality. Nature expresses the law in the process, the supernatural the end to which it tends. Man partakes of the nature of both realms.

The Bible, considered as literature is a book like other books. It is no longer isolated. Its uniqueness consists in its content, its ideals, its inspiring power, the contact into which it introduces us with God and with the spirits of the great men who have lived in communion with him.

"Sin is not a foreign intruder making its appearance suddenly. * * It is the survival of the animal in man, his failure to rise to the higher capacities within him." "So, salvation is not an act wrought once for all in some transcendent realm.

It is a process going on through the ages, and rooted as truly as sin itself in the nature of man. Atonement is not the great exception, it is the universal law of all true living."

As to the relation of the old and the new theology, Dr. Brown holds that there are no absolute antitheses between them, but that they have much in common. The difference between them is that the old regards God as arbitrary, that there is a fixed gulf between world and Church. The new brings God nearer to man, and it bridges the gulf between sacred and secular, sin being replaced by righteousness and love.

"The attitude of the new theology to the old, then, would seem to be that of a criticism which is rooted in sympathy."

Concerning all this we have to say that, while it is about the best apology that can be offered, it impresses us with a sense of vagueness which must inevitably follow from a low view of the Bible and its story of the fall. The new world-view, with inflexible evolution in the material and mental realm, as its cornerstone, rests upon the insecure foundation of a hypothesis which is far from being acceptable to leading thinkers. According to this new theology the element of guilt is largely eliminated from sin, and the deity of Jesus Christ unaccounted for. Frankly we are afraid of this teaching, not that it may not serve as a corrective of misconceptions, but because it runs counter to historic fact and experience. The old theology, especially Calvinism, no doubt, carries some *impedimenta;* but the new has no ballast at all. It looks too much like naturalism tinged with ethics.

The author of "Brain and Personality" and "What is Physical Life" has contributed to the April number of *The Homiletic Review* a scholarly article on "Testimonies of Modern Science to Christian Truths." In this remarkable article Dr. Thomson mentions the interesting fact that we have two brains, just as we have two eyes and two ears; that medical men "Have come upon the epoch-making discovery that the two human brain hemispheres are, in their working, unlike any other pair of organs in the animal world. This unlikeness, moreover, must be solely due to those hemispheres being human, because only thus can we explain why man is man. For the great announcement in short is this, that only one of our two hemispheres is ever the

seat of thought or of any other mental act! It alone talks, reasons, or knows as a human being does these things, while its fellow in the same head does not possess the intelligence of a cat. Therefore it is one hemisphere in us which is the human brain, with those wonderful faculties which make man the image of God, while the other is as unintelligent as is the spinal chord below it."

The American Journal of Theology for January prints Dr. Arthur C. McGiffert's address on "Theological Education" delivered at the Meadville Theological School, June 1909. He holds that the curricula of the Seminaries should be reconstructed to bring them into closer touch with existing conditions. Many new subjects are clamoring for treatment. Students must either content themselves with a mere smattering of knowledge in a great variety of fields or must select a few out of the many and confine their attention to those few. The former is demoralizing, the latter alone rational. Hence there must be an elective system. But the electives must be chosen discriminately. Those things are to be studied which will fit men to be leaders, for the student is to prepare for the active ministry rather than for academic specializing.

There are three departments of study which are absolutely essential to the minister—a knowledge of Christianity, a knowledge of men, and a knowledge of the method of bringing Christianity effectively to bear upon them.

The understanding of Christianity underlies the work of the minister. He must appreciate the genius of this great world movement in order to see what it really is and demands. To understand Christianity one must first of all understand Jesus Christ—not in a theological sense—but in a practical sense by endeavoring to find out what he undertook to do and what he actually did. He must be studied in the light of His environment, not as a supernatural figure, but as a member of the Jewish race and an heir of the great prophets. He must be studied in the light of the Old Testament as far as that reveals Him. As to the question of a study of the original languages, our author says, "Now that that theory [that the Bible is literally the Word of God] has passed away, the study of Hebrew and Greek for the Christian minister must justify itself primarily by show-

ing that it gives him a better understanding of Jesus Christ." Jesus must be studied, also, in connection with his early followers, particularly as revealed in the New Testament. This may involve exegesis, history and theology. Then there must be a knowledge of Christianity in its historic unfolding, and also a study of the comparative religions of the world.

The second great requisite for the theological student is a knowledge of men. This embraces the study of psychology, including the psychology of religion, and of religion itself in its various manifestations. He must know the needs of the particular community in which his lot is cast, as well as the tendencies of the age in which he lives. He must trace institutions and ethical ideals to their origins. He must understand modern trends of thought, and social and economic problems. There should be, indeed, special preparation for special work in city, country, factory districts, slums or university circles.

The third great requisite is the knowledge of application. Hence there must be instruction in method, in what is commonly known as practical theology, embracing homiletics, pastoral care, religious education, "the study of the great religious classics of the world," and special study of particular fields of labor.

All this requires time and the ordinary three years' course is too brief.

This is certainly a fine and a large program. We agree with most of it. Yet the danger of specialization appears on the face of it. Dr. McGiffert is first of all a historian, and hence history is *nearly* everything. The prevailing low views of inspiration, which our author shares, have a tendency to discredit purely biblical studies. Our Church, following in the wake of Luther, happily continues to put much stress on the Word of God, in the faith that it is the vehicle of life and that it contains a balm for all human ills. A thorough appreciation of its teaching concerning sin and its remedy is to our mind after all the key to the situation.

The theological course can not do everything needed to equip a man for the ministry. Unless he bring to the Seminary a well rounded education, a healthy body, a good mind that knows how to think and an earnest inquiring spirit, no Seminary can do for him what Dr. McGiffert suggests. It can not build a great super-structure upon a flimsy foundation. Moreover, there are

the libraries and there is life, and there is the field of labor, and the man himself—these must be teachers as well as the Seminary.

IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M.

Reinhold Seeberg in the first number of the current volume of the *Reformation* has given utterance to a sentiment that is significant for its bearing upon the status and trend of current thought: "On the whole there prevails in the Church and theology of to-day a remarkably languid and listless spirit. Nothing strikingly new can be found. The relations between the 'schools' grow constantly more bitter. The tendency towards exclusiveness is continually on the increase. Men refuse downright to learn or even to hear of those who belong to a different 'party' or 'school.' And so the contest is no longer a grand battle with noble weapons for lofty ends and worthy principles, but a guerrilla warfare over petty proprieties with proud praise for one's own group and its leaders and with despicable belittling of one's opponents and their labor..... And yet withal it is true, as is often observed, that a deep, longing search after religion is again manifesting itself throughout the nation.

I believe that we must grow more practical in the Church. We have had too much theology, too much theoretical refinement, too much apologetic art, too much ecclesiastical politics in the life of the Church. Ours is a day of endless psychological differentiations. The forms of present day life and thought are unspeakably complicated. The constant and urgent demand of the soul therefore is for simple truth, clear, strong, unadulterated truth. Midst the multiform distractions and complexities of modern life there is a dire need for the uniform power of high spiritual authority, for strong unmistakable impulses. Ours is a day which demands the Gospel, pure and simple and free from all theological interpretation. For that Gospel is a great spiritual authority which forces the soul into submission and so makes it free and whole. And after all, this is the matter of supreme importance, the inner spiritual submission to the divine authority, the subjection of soul to the will of God.

Let us not seek to force all religious life into our own modes of expression but let us be willing to bear with other modes.

Would that we might finally reach a mutual understanding in this matter at least! Only one thing we must insist upon: that the mere mode of expression shall not debar anyone from the way to the reality of life. Let us take our stand upon the reality of religion and upon the power of heavenly life and let us turn our backs upon the partisan efforts to overthrow 'Orthodoxy' or to confute 'Liberalism'.....Whoever has felt the dissatisfaction and weariness existing in the Church of the present day may well wish for issues more clearly defined. Whoever has any idea how much has remained unsaid, for reasons of convenience or from lack of courage, which yet smoulders in the quiet, might well long for more open and more telling attacks. But is it really impossible for all parties to understand that the cause we all serve is a holy one and that the weapons too should be holy? Is it really impossible to act henceforth with that understanding?"

These are the words of one who is a great Churchman as well as a great theologian, one who has been involved in theological and ecclesiastical controversies sharp and bitter. And this expression of a sincere desire for the humane arts of theological peace finds many echoes in the hearts of other theologians. The demand for more considerate treatment of opponents in theological discussion finds expression in various quarters. The attitude of fierce polemics and blind, unreasoning prejudice must change to one of charity and temperance and common appreciation. Differences of theological opinion there will probably always be, but the *theologica rabies* may be more and more eliminated by the sincere effort to understand one's opponents and their points of view. This, if we read aright, is the present happy trend. And it will grow in proportion as men learn to solve the personal equation and cease to impugn motives.

However, the practice of the irenical spirit must not be misunderstood to mean necessary concessions to those of other opinions. The contest continues on precisely the same ground, the old positions remain, only the weapons and the methods of attack have changed and the absence of smoke and noise permit of clearer sight and steadier work on both sides. Oberconsistorialrat Bezzel in his New Year's retrospect in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* warns against such gratuitous concessions made out of pure charity. He regards it as one of the chief characteristics

of our practical age that the opposing issues in all spheres of thought are rapidly coming to be more clearly defined and that the abstract theories of the past are constantly assuming more concrete and practical form. In politics the issue between social democracy and monarchy has become very concrete. Likewise in religion the anti-Christian and the anti-religious forces have thrown off the mask. They may be determined to-day with exact precision. And these forces have been aided rather than hindered by the unwise diplomacy of certain conservative elements who in the name of toleration and with a show of "good will and objectivity" have pretended to find a "kernel of truth" where there is none and failing to distinguish between what is central and what is peripheral have made unwarranted concessions in matters really esesntial. It is shooting beyond the mark of Protestant toleration to find worthy elements of truth in monism or to discern real ethical values in the conception of life which excludes God from its system. The very clearness of the issues calls for stouter insistence upon the essentials and closer unity in the non-essentials. We dare not underestimate the enemy. Here the Kepler League is a case in point. It is a notable example of a movement with sharp definition of its boundaries and a clear conception of its function. Its object is to gather together an army of those who believe in a personal and immanent God. There are as a matter of course various divisions and standards within this army. But Christians and Israelites join hands and unite in their common fundamental opposition to the forces of the anti-religious who find their union in their negations.

It is from the clearer definition of issues rather than from the mutual concessions of view or prudent mediations of opinion that a Bezzel hopes for the ultimate attainment of that theological peace and prosperity which Seeberg and others desiderate. The present-day Biblical and psychological method of approach, he thinks, will lead to separations and clarifications, to divisions and decisions, to numerous negations on the one hand and deeper more enlightened positions on the other. And from these full-blown oppositions we may expect the beginning of that kingdom of peace which returns every thousand years and which will finally lead to the last millennium of true freedom in unshakeable conviction.

In connection with what Seeberg says concerning the listless spirit in the Church and the partisan spirit in theology, it is interesting to note a recent utterance from one of the spokesmen of the liberal camp. It is the Nuremberg pastor, Dr. Rittelmeyer, champion of the "inner light," who speaks. He addresses the Friends of the Christian World upon the subject, "What is Wrong with the Modern Theology?" By "modern" theology he means the liberal theology. His address is published in the *Christliche Welt* and widely commented on especially by the conservative press.

The very name of "modern" theology, he says, is at once an indication of the utter weakness of the entire movement,—no positive religious ideal. He enumerates three good qualities of the movement which everyone must admit, sincerity, open-mindedness, and energetic enterprise, and then proceeds to his indictment. "Let us ask ourselves candidly, what has the modern theology actually accomplished in a practical way? There is indeed a veritable army of men ready to battle against the dominion of orthodoxy, dogma, and confessional constraint. But the millions of the laboring classes are not only indifferent or sceptical as to our work but in Germany at least they are actually opposed to us..... Possibly the religious life of the laborer must come under the moulding power of older forms of Christianity than those we represent. At any rate the form in which we offer the Christian religion has proved itself incapable of making a stronger impresison upon the laboring masses or of exercising a greater influence upon them than the older form did. And at the present rate there is small hope for improvement.

And how about the educated classes? Our work among them has long been our hobby. But with what result? True, there is a considerable number of persons who owe it exclusively to the modern theology that in these times of severe spiritual crises they have been able to satisfy their religious needs, and have been able to preserve their piety as well as their religion. But this number is comparatively insignificant. What are 5000 subscribers for a paper like *Die Christliche Welt* with its brilliant staff of contributors? And more than half of these are theologians, many of whom receive the paper without reading it.

Concerning our narrower organizations, the Friends of the Christian World, it must be said that the rank and file of the

laity has remained untouched by them. The laymen who have associated themselves with us are for the most part special cases, college teachers who have studied theology, philologists and lawyers who are the sons, brothers, or friends of pastors, the friends of university professors, and a few other families whose interest has been aroused by their household instructor. That is about all. Whole large classes of people have remained almost entirely unaffected by our work. Such are, for example, the army officers, the engineeers and technicists in general, almost the entire large class of merchants, etc. On the whole, we are compelled to face the stubborn fact that the modern theology has not succeeded in calling forth a single movement in any way significant or remarkable. The works that have taken best have been the enlightening and intellectually revolutionizing works. Thus the widest reading has been given to Harnack's "What is Christianity?" the "Popular Traacts on Historical Religion," the Biblical work of Weiss, and most recently Schiele's Dictionary of "The Religion of the Past and Present." These are the works of the modern theology that have had the greatest success. And yet their success can scarcely be said to have redounded to our own credit. The so-called "enlightened" have seldom remained standing upon that which we have offered them in the way of positive results....."

The reasons for this weakness and barrenness Rittelmeyer finds in a number of different facts. In the first place, the modern theology is essentially a product of criticism. And this has been continually negative, removing piece by piece the ruined edifice of the old faith. Now it is true that all great religious movements of the past have consisted in the removal of encumbrances and the simplification of content, but when that change has come about through negative criticism and not through the deepening of religious experience the result must always be an utter lack of vital power. And so it has been in this case. For example, the Fatherhood of God, that factor which has always wrought so powerfully in traditional Christianity, has been tempered and toned and modified by the modern theology until all Christology has been removed from it and there remains only a very attenuated belief in Providence and a vague, powerless faith in the forgiveness of sins. The same religious emptiness is shown in the advanced theologian's idea of the infinite and

eternal value of the human soul. Likewise as to his conception of the living God, and his conception of Christ's Person. The results have been only negative, always sceptical. The devotional literature of the liberal theology is too intellectual, too cold and polite, to affect life or to furnish religious impulses.

Moreover, the liberal theology has been too narrow and circumscribed in its interests. It is out of joint with the times. The modern world of action has gone one direction, the modern theology has gone another. The advanced theology is out of touch with real life and burning questions of to-day. The remedy for all these weaknesses Rittelmeyer would see in what practically amounts to greater liberality and still more modern qualities, less attention to the questions which orthodoxy imposes, less effort to refute the positions of the orthodox party, and a bolder, freer effort to answer the passing, practical religious needs of the present. A new humanity he would beget, and to that end he recommends his own peculiar philosophy of religion.

This utterance the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* tersely calls a declaration of bankruptcy.But it must be said in justice to the cause that Rittelmeyer represents that he distinctly disavows any judgment concerning the scientific character or achievements of the moderns. He is speaking of the liberal theology purely and solely as a historical manifestation in the Church life of the present. And he speaks the truth. He might have mentioned as further indications that the liberal theology is not flourishing in practice, the fact that in Hamburg the Friends of the Christian World have been obliged to discontinue their meetings on account of lack of interest and funds. The *Gemeindebote für Norddeutschland,* for many years the organ of the very liberal *Protestantenverein,* has ceased to appear because of lack of contributors and lack of subscribers. The new Hamburg *Gemeindeblatt* devoted to the liberal conception of Christianity has utterly failed to find support. In the past four elections of pastors in that city orthodox pastors have been chosen to take the place of liberals. And yet Hamburg has been a veritable hot-bed of liberal theology and has a large number of the ablest and most aggressive personalities representing the advanced views. So that the recent occurrences there are admitted even by the *Chronik der Christlichen Welt* to indicate

the beginning of the decline of ecclesiastical and theological liberalism.

But these temporary retrogressions of liberal theology in the sphere of practical life, whatever their significance may be, have not apparently brought any large measure of reassurance to those who would preserve the traditional forms of Christian thought and life. The demands for more liberal religious instruction in the schools continue loud. The prospect of a disadvantageous separation of Church and State has not disappeared. The destructive forces of anti-Christian socialism are growing constantly stronger. The pernicious influence of anti-religious monism has not entirely ceased. So that the spiritual ills continue, even if the modern theology has not furnished the effective remedy. The conservative Church authorities manifest more and more concern for purity of doctrine and a constantly increasing anxiety about the souls of those committed to their care. Consistorial monitions are issued. Pastoral pleadings and threats are made in the effort to stem the tide. In Prussia the State Church has seen fit to institute legal proceedings against the very liberal but meritorious Pastor Jatho of Cologne. This is the first application of the Prussian law against false doctrine. The trial has aroused widespread and passionate interest. It is regarded by many as a veritable crisis for the Church of Prussia and the outcome is awaited with great anxiety.

In these measures of the conservative ecclesiastics Rade of Marburg sees the exact Protestant counterpart to the recent strenuous measures of the Vatican against modernism in the Catholic Church, a subject which occupies a large place in current German literature both religious and profane. The Pope's Motupropio of Sept. 1st., 1910, repeats the disciplinary orders of the encyclical Pascendi (1907) and demands of all priests and officials on pain of inquisition and excommunication summary subscription to a lengthy oath severely repudiating modernism in all forms. This is the direct and inevitable consequence of the Vatican dogma (1870) of the doctrinal infallibility of the Pope. The anti-modernist oath has been the subject of very bitter comment in the Protestant and in the secular press, and has met with no small degree of passive resistance within the Catholic Church itself. And although the theological professors in

the State universities and the teachers of religion in the State schools are permitted to secure from their bishops a dispensation from the oath if they so desire, yet the papal letter of New Year's Day brings very strong moral pressure to bear upon them, and that too in terms insulting to Protestant professors. This papal constraint of State servants is interpreted by the Germans as a direct affront to the State and has called forth a vigorous protest of the Imperial Chancellor in the Diet. In some quarters the demand is even made for the dissolution of the Catholic theological faculties and the complete legal dishabilitation of the Catholic Church, as in France and Portugal. The danger of this does not seem imminent, but certain it is that Germany threatens to become involved in another Kulturkampf like that between Bismarck and Pius IX, and the prospects for a third Canossa are slight.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE XIII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

Introduction to Philosophy. By William Jerusalem, Ph.D., Lecturer in Philosophy and Pedagogy at the University of Vienna. Authorized Translation from the fourth edition by Charles F. Sanders, A.M., Professor of Philosophy, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa. Pp. 319. Price $1.50 net.

When things were deemed identical with what they seem life presented but few problems. As long as phenomena were not distinguished from some essence which lies back of them and both phenomenon and material substrate were regarded as one and the same, naive realism was troubled by no idealistic dreams.

The sense of wonder is said to be the beginning of philosophy; but it is the wonder which is created by the experience of a mind that has learned to observe and to think that is the mother of real philosophy. After all, things are not what they seem. There are appearances, and there are realities. How are they related, and what is really true and substantial?

Every observing thinking mind has a philosophy of some kind, and every intellectual production is tinged by some kind of philosophy of life. The work of science, of systematic treatment of any sort of material, mental, or religious discipline, has the philosophy of its author woven into the fabric, consciously or unconsciously. But unless the philosophy is really scientific, connected, logical, the work of the author lacks the element of a true world view. At points unseen by the writer, and unrecognizable by him, his inconsistent epistemology invalidates his thought-system, and when his scheme is thought out to the end in relation to other departments of knowledge, it is found to be self-contradictory, and inadequate as an answer to world problems.

To understand, weigh, and be profited by educational discipline, the student should be in possession of some measure of critical faculty to guide him in his pursuits. An introduction to philosophy is a prerequisite of every trained mind for a true knowledge and appreciation of the world of thought and of matter. The mysteries of mind and matter unravel themselves to the clear thinker. It is the clear mind that grapples well with the problems of life.

Religion and philosophy are most intimately related, and a

false philosophic theory, an inadequate world view, will vitiate, or endanger the ethical and religious conceptions and ideals of society. An introduction to philosophy is an introduction to a total world view, and should be a clarifying, consistent guide in the sphere of reflective life, a life which embraces ideals, purpose, and destiny, touching morals, religion and the practical and social interests of mankind.

The master of pedagogy seeks to furnish an introduction to philosophy, which with vividness gives objectivity, perspicuity, and brevity of treatment. A clear presentation not wearying by details is desirable for the student just being initiated into logical intellectual principles of philosophic character.

Dr. Jerusalem has commendably succeeded in producing such a work. His introduction is a carefully arranged system, presenting a clear aspect of the subject. Psychology, Epistemology, Metaphysics, Aesthetics, Ethics, and Sociology, receive brief, but clear and forcible treatment.

What is the relation between mind and matter? Which is real, or both? Does the material world furnish all there is in thinking mind, or does the mind create its own external world? Is soul a mere function of matter, or matter a mere contribution which the mind creates for itself? Which is true, Idealism, or Realism? Wherein lies reality?

Plato recognized an external world, but thought its essence was constituted of immaterial ideas. There was no material, only an ideal substrate. Kant said that we know only phenomena, only things as they appear, not things in themselves. What things really are in themselves we cannot tell; the noumenon which lies back of the phenomenon is still a mystery, an insoluble problem. But Kant admitted the fact of an external world standing over against thinking mind. There is reality beyond the subjective which entertains it, and reflects upon it.

Critical Realism is the philosophy of Dr. Jerusalem, but a realism which has more objectivity than a mere noumenal state.

As to the soul of man in relation to matter, Dr. Jerusalem accepts and teaches a dualism. The soul is an entity, something that stands over against matter; but not a material entity, which logically would resolve itself into matter, and result in materialistic monism. The soul is an entity, immaterial, psychical, and as such, unresolvable into material substrate, or mere organic structure or action. Dualistic psychology recognizes two separate but interacting principles. The soul is too subtle for definite analysis, an analysis which would have to be expressed in terms of material entity into which the soul is not resolvable.

The relation of Creator to the material universe as taught by the author is that of Immanent Teleology. God does not work from without, but from within nature. His action is not by external tools, but by the inner principle of life. Evolution is

thus a mode of divine action. God is not ruled out of the world, but is the living Rule within it. God is transcendent as well as immanent; there is no pantheism material or spiritual.

As Immanent Teleology is God's method in the world of matter, it is likewise His method in the sphere of Ethics. God works from within outward in the growth of ethical principles in man. The origin of moral idea and action is through genetic and biologic principles. In the human consciousness the sense of ethical distinctions and duties is awakened in man in the social state by genetic impulses. The divine voice is heard not from the clouds, but speaks within, and works outward through the organic regulation of society. A higher than a human principle works, but works in and through the human by a growing ethical consciousness.

> "The anguished tear-stained face is just as real
> As dew-besprinkled sweetly-scented rose;
> The moral sensibility can feel
> As tender bud 'gainst which the north wind blows."

The question of free will or of determinism is vital in relation to ethical obligations. If man is a mere automaton, a creature controlled by forces external to himself, in relation to which the attitude of his will has no play, ethical obligations are but a sentiment and human action without praise or blame.

> "We tremble at the rigors of a sphere
> Unswerving in its ceaseless cycle-whirl
> Of stern necessity, existence drear
> As brainless clam without one moral pearl."

Since philosophy and theology are so intimately related the theologian must be discriminating in his view of man's moral helplessness, as well as his responsibilities in matters of theological science. Where does determinism end, and where does ethical responsibility begin, in the sphere of soteriology?

Freedom of will is both psychological and metaphysical. The will to act, the power to cause decisions, is a psychological function, is psychological freedom. Metaphysical freedom means that the will that causes decisions has itself no cause, that it is impelled or influenced by no anterior cause or antecedent event. That man causes decisions is not doubted, but to say that the actions of man's will are absolutely uncaused leads to Pelagianism, affirms metaphysical freedom, and makes man the author of his own salvation. Man in his present moral state has psychological freedom, but not metaphysical freedom.

Is man's will a real *agens*, a first cause? or is there some an-

terior influence antecedent to his moral choice? The failure to distinguish between psychological and metaphysical freedom has given rise to endless controversy among theologians.

A man religiously influenced by prevenient action from God chooses by psychological freedom, and is not a first cause of his moral change. The will to be moral, to be spiritual, is not without antecedent grace, not without divine illumination of man's intellect. Pelagianism makes man spiritually and morally his own creator by regarding him as acting from choices which he has willed without anterior spiritual causes. Metaphysical freedom of will in man makes him an agent of first cause.

Dr. Jerusalem does not treat this phase of theological discipline, as it is apart from his philosophic purview; but his distinction between psychological and metaphysical freedom forms a correct basis for the solution of this important question. His philosophical implications bear favorably upon this phase of theological discipline.

> "The blind unbending stubbornness we see
> Is harmony that cannot be unstrung;
> Concessions to eternal right's the key
> To every symphony that's yet unsung."

Dr. Jerusalem has realized his aim in the perspicuity of the treatment of his themes, and has also contributed valuable help toward the solution of profound problems.

The translation is from the fourth edition of the work. The form and typography are pleasing. But one error has been observed, overlooked in the reading of the proof; on page 141, line 13, *have* should read *has*.

The translation is felicitous. Professor Sanders has done no mere perfunctory or mechanical work, but has entered into the spirit of the author and made the translation share in the perspicuity of the original expression. The translator becomes the author's English self.

M. COOVER.

The Ascended Christ. By Henry Barclay Swete, D.D. Pp. xvi, 168. Cloth. Price 80 cents net.

One is first of all impressed with the excellence of style displayed in the composition of this book. There is a beauty of simplicity and a clearness of expression that is especially worthy of note on account of the subject discussed. For this takes us at once out of the realm of material things, with which we are more easily acquainted, into the realm of the spiritual and heavenly, which is mysterious. But the mystery surrounding the subject never beclouds the author's form of expression.

The study of "The Ascended Christ" has not received as full attention as that of his previous life in the flesh. No doubt the reason is partly because "Christ Ascended" is beyond the powers of material sense to apprehend; and we give more attention to that "which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life." Something of this is suggested by the first reason which the author states in a Postscript explaining the "purpose in such a study of the work of the Ascended Christ": "The Ascension and Ascended Life bear witness against the materialistic spirit which threatens in some quarters to overpower those higher interests that have their seat in the region of the spiritual and eternal." The other statements in this Postscript furnish a forceful stimulus to the study of the book, and together with his Introduction show the practical benefits that must flow from meditation upon things of Christ which are yet so above our common experience that to a great extent they can only be represented to us by means of symbols.

The study is thorough, and while by no means neglectful of the work of other scholars on the subject, it is with refreshing independence of thought based upon the only real source of authority,—that which is furnished by "the Acts, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, which contain the testimony of the Spirit of Jesus to the Ascended Christ."

Within the limit of so small a number of pages, the author presents a surprisingly full and satisfactory discussion under the chapter headings: The Ascension and the Session; The King; The Priest; The Prophet; The Head; The Mediator, Intercessor, and Advocate; The Forerunner; The Presence in the Midst; The Coming One; and The Judge.

As an example of the beauty and clearness of expression, as well as for the interest of the quotation itself, we will append a paragraph from the author's reference to the Ascended Christ as "The Priest." "There can be no doubt that the Eucharist stands in a very special relation both to the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ and to His priestly Self-presentation in heaven. Our Lord's own words of instruction give this great Sacrament a double character. On one side it is an act of Communion: *take, eat.....drink ye all of it,* can leave no doubt upon this point. One of the greatest blessings which the Reformation of the sixteenth century brought to the Church of England was the restoration to the laity of the Cup which is the Blood of the Covenant; perhaps the most hopeful factor in the religious movements of the nineteenth century has been the widespread return of the religious Church-people to the primitive practice of weekly communion. But the emphasis thus laid upon the act of Communion must not be suffered to divert attention from the other revealed purpose of the sacrament. It is also an act of

Commemoration; He who said, *Take, eat.....drink,* said also, *This do for my memorial.* This act of Commemoration, so far as we can see, is intended to be the Church's counterpart on earth to the Self-presentation of our Lord in heaven. Neither in heaven nor on earth can there be any repetition of the Sacrifice, but only a presentation before God of the One full, perfect, and sufficient Offering. In heaven this presentation is made by the Ascended Christ Himself."

His statment of the Real Presence, in a later chapter, adds to the significance of the Sacrament as we enjoy it: "In this universal adoration of the Lamb, this conglorification of the Incarnate, sacrificed, glorified Son with the Eternal Father, the Church joins, as she kneels before the earthly symbols of His Presence, worshipping not an absent Lord, but one who is really and indeed in the midst of His people. No adoration, of course, is intended or ought to de done to the symbols—it is not the symbolic Figure of the Lamb that all heaven worships—nor to any corporal or localized presence whatsoever; the Real Presence is after the manner of the spiritual life into which the humanity of the Lord has passed. But where Christ is present, although His presence is not corporal, He is to be adored."

H. ANSTADT.

The Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah. By John Edgar McFadyen, D.D., Professor of O. T., United Free Church College, Glasgow. Cloth 5 x 6½. Pp. 421. Price 90 cts. net.

This volume belongs to "The Bible for Home and School" series, which on the whole is characterized by great merit. Dr. McFadyen has brought to his comments much learning and clear insight. His material arrangement of the book of Isaiah is among the very best. In some respects it excels that of the Revised Version. He shows a remarkable appreciation of the genius of the great prophet, as an orator, statesman, and representative of God.

He agrees with many modern critics that the prophet can be credited with only the first thirty-nine chapters, and that chapters 40-55 are from another, and the concluding chapters, 56-66, from a third.

The spirit of discussion is thoroughly devout and there is no effort to deny the hand of God in history. Nevertheless, the author does not see those clear and unmistakable references to Christ in those so-called Messianic passages which the Christian Church has cherished from the beginning. To be just to him, however, let us quote his concluding remark concerning the prophecy, "For unto us a child is born," &c. "Surely it is not unnatural," says he, "to see in these great words an adumbration of the empire established by Christ." So also in reference to

the Servant of Jehovah in the second division, including the fifty-third chapter, the author says "It was a true instinct that led the N. T. Church to see in it an adumbration of the sufferings, the work, and the triumph of our Lord." (p. 236).

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie M.A., D.D., and other scholars. Volume iii, Burial—Confessions. Cloth, 8 x 11 inches. Pp. xvi, 901. Price $7.00.

The comparatively brief part of the alphabetical list of subjects covered by the present volume of the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* shows its stupenduous character. The thoroughness of treatment is apparent from the character and number of contributors, of whom there are one hundred and sixty-nine to this volume alone. Eighty pages, under twenty-four headings, are devoted to the subject "Calendar." About the same may be said of "Charms and Amulets." "Circumcision" is set forth in a dozen pages by five specialists. The article on "Confessions" covers seventy pages and is unusually thorough. This Cyclopaedia is unique in its scope. It fills an otherwise unoccupied place. With so much to commend it is not strange that there should be here and there a minor slip. It is intimated (p. 846) that Luther revised the various drafts of the Augsburg Confession. This is not true of its final form. Moreover, the statement of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper shows a lack of comprehension. The assertion (p. 147) that Zwingli was preaching a pure gospel in Switzerland "before Luther's name had been heard of" is entirely gratuitious. "Zwingli's dependence upon Luther may without hesitation be asserted as a settled historical fact. * * Zwingli himself denies all such dependence. But we can understand also the sad self-deception to which he has here fallen a victim. The study of the Scriptures was and remained for him the source of his doctrinal views; and he found Luther's ideas in the Scriptures —after he had learned them from Luther." Seeberg, H. D., ii, 308.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Messages of the Poets (being Vol. vii of *The Messages of the Bible*). By Nathanael Schmidt, M. A. New York.

Was Job the most patient man, as our childhood Bible drill used to assure us? Or was he, like Prometheus, the defiantly impatient man, storming the very gates of heaven in an en-

deavor to secure justice from God? The endeavor to clothe Job with the garment of resignation makes him an unreal personage, somewhat removed from our common humanity. Job has not been as one of us. For we find it hard to submit to the sufferings meted out to us in a world of injustice. We cry out against the sorrows decreed us and push from us the bitter cup. Was Job any better than ourselves, an impossible model as are so many other Bible characters? Or was he like us in entering his protest at the bar of God?

At last we are recovering many hitherto veiled books of the Bible. Job is not the human impossibility we supposed him. First of all, he is not an historic character, any more than Jonah, or Prometheus or Faust. He is a fictitious character, set before us in his truly human qualities, voicing the agonized cry of humanity for justice. He is a creation of some gifted poet, whose name is lost. The book is poetic, one of the masterpieces of literature, only now coming to its own proper place, lifted to a high station in its art, its powerful conception, its dramatic form.

Then, again, Job is seen to be not the meekly submissive and patient person, type for all rebellious souls to pattern after. No; far from that. He is thoroughly human, exclaiming that he would like to meet God, that he might order his argument and seek justice at the bar of heaven. He wants to know a reason for the frightful experiences he has endured. His friends tell him it is in his sin. This Job indignantly denies. Not that he he is sinless, but he declares he has committed no sin so great as to deserve such sore punishment. He can not submit to so dire a fate without protest. He cries out against the unreasonableness, unfairness of it all.

How the discussion of his fate by his three friends with their futile endeavors after a solution, brings in almost every other subject with which the mind of man sooner or later has to deal; how the final outcome is a confession of man's utter inability to solve the mystery of life—and all the other interesting questions that arise—the reader of this new volume must discover for himself. This commentary is by far the best that has yet been written upon the book of Job. It is compact, not a useless word is found in it; it is clear, even illuminating; it is scholarly, with a very extended bibliography; it is modest, but it is frankly confident. After reading this very lucid, entertaining and suggestive book, the greatest Hebrew poem becomes a new piece of literature and life is better understood.

But this great epic is not the only book of the Bible treated in this little volume. Canticles becomes a collection of lyrics. Its true nature is discovered. One feels that this is the final word to be said about the Songs of Solomon. These lyrics are songs sung by lovers, are frankly human, even sensual. Their

basis is the basis of all love-songs—pure enough, but thoroughly natural. The old-fashioned method of finding in the Songs of Solomon types of Christ and the Church will no longer hold. We may no longer read our meanings into this book, nor any other for that matter. What it meant to the originals it must mean to us. Mr. Schmidt has succeeded in unravelling this most perplexing problem and, so doing, has placed the scholarly world under lasting obligations to himself.

The place of poetry among the Hebrews was similar to that which it occupies among other nations. With all their religion, and it is a superior, even a supreme religion, they were human beings, men of like passions and like aspirations with ourselves. These emotions they expressed in their poems. So understood these poems bring us their messages of reality; the Bible appeals to us with greater force than ever. God is seen to be among us as surely as He was among them. So the message of the poets is the eternal message of love and good-will.

The thorough mastery of the critical problems, the wide reading, the close study, the painstaking fidelity that have gone into the making of this little book make it invaluable to any honest student of the book of Job and the Songs of Solomon.

D. W. WOODS.

G. AND C. MERRIMAN CO. SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Webster's New International Dictionary. Leather; 9 x 12 x 4½. Pp. 2700. Copyright 1909.

The new Webster is a truly superb volume with its 2700 pages, 6,000 illustrations, and 400,000 words with their definitions. The work is practically new and not a mere revision of former editions. Numerous and competent scholars have labored for ten years to make this great volume, which has already met with an enthusiastic reception. Guided by the general style and spirit of the older editions, the editors have not been bound by traditions but have made improvements wherever possible.

The most striking innovation in the form is that of dividing pages horizontally with a line, the more important and familiar words being given above the line, and the less important and unfamiliar in smaller type below. This simple device is a great time saver.

Another new feature is the incorporation in the body of the work of the separate tables of Proper Names, Foreign Phrases and Proverbs, Noted Fictitious Persons, and Abbreviations. This will be appreciated by those who in the past have sought such things in appendixes. There are, however, four useful appendixes: a Gazetter or Geographical Dictionary, a Biographical Dictionary, a classified arrangement of Arbitrary Signs used in

Writing and Printing, and a classified selection of Pictorial Illustrations.

The spelling is that sanctioned by the usage of the best writers, giving recognition to any widely prevailing differences. "Reformed Spelling" also receives recognition. The Definitions are scholarly and at the same time simple. New words are carefully defined and misinterpretations corrected. The Pronunciations are given in phonetic spelling and markings in a simple, unmistakable way.

Webster's New International Dictionary is the product of patience, skill, wisdom, experience, learning and treasure. It is, indeed, a great book worthy of a place in every home and school and office.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

The Great Teachers of Judaism and Christianity. By Charles Foster Kent. Pp. 166. Cloth. Price 75 cents net.

Religious education has been more tardy than the secular in securing competent instruction for the young. Our public school system has not yet reached the acme of care in its requirements of qualification in teachers; but our Sunday Schools have been too easily satisfied to commit the teaching to the willing, without much consideration of competency. It must be said that necessity, to a great extent, has compelled it; but this is a serious impeachment of such Christians as are capable but unwilling to teach, or it is a humiliating acknowledgment of inability among our adult church members. However, the commendable and promising efforts tht are being made in "teacher training" are designed to correct this unfortunate condition that has existed in our Sunday School work.

This book is the first of a series, published and in preparation, of twenty "Modern Sunday School Manuals." If the excellence of the series were not sufficiently guaranteed by the editorial management of Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University, who is himself the author of our book under review, such names among the other contributors as Dean Hodges, Dr. Hurlburt, Marion Lawrence, Mrs. J. W. Barnes, and Dr. Edw. I. Bosworth would give additional assurance.

This book grew out of a series of lectures on "The Aims and Methods of Israel's Teachers" given on several different occasions by invitation of the Sunday School Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of California, and delivered also at various universities and colleges and before various groups of Sunday School workers. There is inspiration as well as practical sug-

gestion for the modern religious teacher in this careful study of "the character, aims and methods of the great religious teachers who have recorded their work not only in the Bible, but also in the very bone and marrow of our modern civilization." Among the ancient Israelites the author distinguishes three types of teachers, each with its own task and contributing its peculiar development of the individual and the nation.

The great Hebrew "prophets" were the conscience of the race. Highly educated, patriotic and heroic, they pointed out and opposed the evils of their day; inculcating principles of justice and mercy, finding in Jehovah's character the "ultimate reason for right doing" and striving to make the will of God the guiding influence in the daily lives of the people as a whole.

The "priests," influential in the community, coming in close personal touch with the individual, made clear by word and symbol the great principles of the prophects. They were especially concerned with guarding the sacred institutions and teaching the people how to worship, though mindful also of their personal conduct.

The "wise men" or "sages" of Israel constitute the third class of teachers. They gave great attention to the form in which they presented their teachings, using the proverb, similitude, riddle, paradox and parable to develop character. They were personal counsellors.

The author discusses also the later teaching of the "scribes and rabbis"; and then with satisfying fulness and search-analysis presents the training and aims and methods of "the Great Teacher" and of the early Christian teachers. The plan of the book throughout is to study first the history, character and aims of each class of teachers, and then examine the methods they employed. The closing chapter is an appropriate emphasis on the importance of the teaching function, showing the "larger conception of a religious education" that the church must realize to-day. The author gives evidence of his own strong qualification as a teacher by the discriminating analysis he has made of the duties and methods of "The Great Teachers of Judaism and Christianity." The book would furnish helpful advanced study for our Sunday School teacher training classes.

H. ANSTADT.

THE WESTMINSTER PRESS.

The Historic Episcopate. By Rev. Robert Ellis Thomson, S.T.D., LL.D. Cloth. Price $1.50.

The author, Dr. Thomson, for years in the University of Pennsylvania, as professor of Political Economy, Professor of History and Librarian, and for eighteen years President of the Central

High School of Philadelphia, is one of the most learned and versatile of the scholars of America.

The work was written "in the belief that the claims made for what is called 'The Historic Episcopate' have been, as Dr. Liddon admits, a chief obstacle to Christian unity."

The "Table of Contents" presents the following: The New Testament Age, The Presbyterian Fathers, The Ignatian Epistles, From Senate to Monarch, Gradation, From Pastor to Prelate, The Episcopate of the Middle Ages, Tudor Anglicanism, Stuart Anglicanism, Modern Anglicanism, Outlook.

These titles of chapters are in themselves apt, suggestive and informing. Then,too, Dr. Thomson's learning and scholarship are so varied, rich and ample that his pages abound in important facts and ideas that richly repay extended thought and reflection upon them.

He demonstrates many things, among which are the following: The New Testament knows nothing of a "bishop" as that term is now understood. Christ forbids such prominence and power over brethren as "bishops" have. The new Testament bishop and presbyter are identical. The claim that the episcopate started in Asia under the Apostle John as a check to heresy is unfounded. Such a thing as the Apostolic Succession of monarchic bishops as distinct from presbyter bishops was not claimed by any before Cyprian about 250, and he—the high churchman and would be ecclesiarch of the early Church--claims for the bishops what he wishes for them rather than actual facts. Even after monarchic bishops were found in some parts of the Church, for a long time they took their offices without ordination, or were ordained by presbyters, as Jerome and others assert of Alexandria. That in the first six Christian centuries the development was from the pastor or pastors of a congregation called presbyters or bishops to a bishop of a congregation with his co-presbyters; to a bishop who had charge of a district; to a prelate and archbishop or "patriarch," in a central city and finally and logically to the pope at Rome as an universal monarchic bishop;—all this development being in harmony with the worldly spirit that came into the Church and harmonized with civil and military organizations in the Roman Empire. The claims of modern "churchmen" that "The Historic Episcopate" is apostolic in origin and was developed by the "Apostolic Fathers," is based on unreliable traditions, is supported by assigning to terms used in the New Testament and in the writings of the early "Fathers," modern meanings which a just discrimination in their use shows to have been impossible. The whole claim for "The Historic Episcopate," as apostolic or a part of the Church in the period immediately following the apostles, or as general in the Church before the lapse of several centuries or as an essential mark of the Church in any period, is, judged by

Scripture and history, a worthless tissue of shreds and patches. The bishops and other scholars of the Church of England during the century from Cranmer to Laud did not hold episcopacy to be essential to the being of the Church or deny the validity of ordination in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. The Church of England has never officially denied the validity of non-episcopal ordaining though many of her men like Laud and the Tractarians and other high churchmen have. Dr. Thomson deals so carefully and critically with the historic sources that his work is of the first importance. His thorough use of the New Testament, the writings of Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome and others down to the present is satisfactory and his conclusions irrefutable, viz:

1. "The Historic Episcopate" is an "institution evolved in the second Christian century, without either apostolic sanction or necessity in the life of the Church, and is no more a part of the Christian Church order than is the papacy, its child and heir."

2. "The hypothesis of an apostolical succession of manually consecrated bishops as the necessary channel of grace in the Christian Church—is a conception first originated by Cyprian of Carthage, and elaborated from age to age by the later fathers, the Roman canonists since 1570, and the Anglican polemics since 1589."

He asks: "Are these to remain the permanent obstacle to a reunion of our Protestant Christendom?"

Dr. Thomson, scholar though he is, nods a little at times as the following items prove. He calls Melanchthon a presbyter, p. 156. Melanchthon was not ordained. He says: "The Swedish episcopacy has not the hall-mark of an apostolical succession." As men of the Church of England understand that term, the Swedish Lutheran bishops are in the line of apostolic succession. Within a year leading English bishops have visited Sweden and have recognized the "apostolical succession" of the Swedish bishops. cf. Dr. C. M. Butler's *Reformation in Sweden,* an article in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY on *The Historic Episcopate in the Lutheran Church,* Jan., 1891, and the *American Church Review,* 1881.

While it is probable that much more than Dr. Thomson considers will have to be settled before there can be a union of Protestant Christendom, there can be no doubt that his able and notable work can be read and studied with great profit by all who deplore the existence of so many sects and schisms in the Church for which the Lord died and for whose unity He prayed. Dr. Thomson's book is a bearer of truth. May it also be a harbinger of peace and unity.

F. P. MANHART.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

The Nature of God, A series of Lectures. By J. A. Hall, D.D. Cloth. Pp. vi, 328.

The lectures which make up this volume were delivered before the students of Wittenberg Theological Seminary, Springfield, Ohio, during the winter of 1908 and 1909. They are well worth preservation and circulation in their present form. They reveal not only research but independent thought on the part of their author. The language is simple and forceful. At the same time the matter is so weighty that the book requires slow reading. The contents embrace a discussion of the following topics: The Failure of Philosophy, Religion, The Origin, Seat and Content of Religion, The Certainty of Religious Knowledge, Anthropomorphism, The Trinity. The author affirms "that the Existence of God cannot be logically demonstrated. We cannot deduce by self-evident logic that which has no self-evident axioms behind it. The world and self and God are alike in being final postulates of thought, yet the existence of neither is capable of demonstration. Proofs there are in plenty; but they are not those which hold in the realm of either mathematics or logic."

The three philosophical arguments usually urged—the *cosmological,* the *teleological* and the *ontological*—are pronounced to be utterly powerless to force conviction. It is alleged that the cosmological argument is defective in deducing an Infinite Final Cause from merely finite premises. The teleological proof is declared to have "been abandoned by most, if not all, thinkers who have kept pace with the march of investigation." "For convincing the skeptic" * * "the design argument has ceased to be of service" * * "It proves nothing" "And so the carpenter theory of the world has to be abandoned." The ontological argument fares no better at the hands of our author. On its strictly logical side it has failed to carry conviction, for it cannot be shown that a necessary relation exists between subjective conceptions and objective reality.

"Let us own that these arguments," says our author, * * "have not been without value. They have been helpful. But they have been helpful to those alone who, either consciously or unconsciously, have already accepted the facts which by laborious arguments they seek to prove."

Now in reference to all this it may be freely acknowledged that the above mentioned "theistic arguments" do not furnish an irrefutable demonstration of the existence of an Infinite God. Nevertheless we believe that, when properly understood, they afford the strongest presumption of the divine existence. The Author of the Universe which includes man, an undying personality indisputably greater than matter, must be an Infinite

Spirit. These several proofs moreover must be taken together in their cumulative force.

Philosophy has failed in its search after God because (1) "of its refusal to deal honestly with the problem of the world, in that it ignores the differences presented by it," and (2) "of its rigid adherence to the logical method." Pantheism, Idealism and Materialism are all fallacious and fail to account for things as they really are. But philosophy is not without value when confined to its proper sphere "of sifting the facts, of verifying them, of separating them from the accidental..*..*..of giving them that form which systematic knowledge must at last assume." Its true place is that of hand-maid to religion.

The real proof of the existence of God must be sought in religion, which means fellowship with God. The origin of religion can be found only in the primeval revelation which God made of Himself in the Garden of Eden. There is the only rational explanation of how the idea of God became lodged in the human soul.

The author places himself squarely upon the Bible as the true explanation of our knowledge, faith and hope. It alone interprets the soul and shows it the way to God through Jesus Christ by the help of the Holy Spirit.

Space forbids a further examination of this excellent volume. We can pause only to notice what we believe to be an error which our author seems to share with the advocates of the so-called "absolute religion" like Dorner and Martensen. This theory (and it is nothing more) of "absolute religion" holds that the Son would have become incarnate in order to perfect humanity even if man had not sinned. Our author says, "When we had admitted the spiritual nature of the Deity, there is no possible escape from the conclusion that He will become incarnate—for a spiritual being the incarnation is a necessity" (p. 262). However, we may seek to avoid it, the conclusion cannot be escaped, that the incarnation is the necessary goal of that infinite power and love which are the possession of the perfect person." (p. 265 f.).

These assertions contain implications that the creation of man was a necessary act of God and that as a "Perfect Person" He must needs become incarnate. These appear to conflict with the nature of God as absolute; and certainly, from the standpoint of the divine purpose concerning man, it has no standing in the Bible. The simple and satisfactory explanation of the incarnation of the Son is that he came to seek and to save that which was lost.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Pupil and the Teacher. Lutheran Teacher-Training Series, Book Two. By Luther A. Weigle, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Carleton College. Pp. 217. Cloth. 50 cents net. Paper 35 cents net.

The first part of this work sets forth the nature of the child during the different periods of its growth and development, thus indicating the importance of adaptation in teaching to these various stages of its life. So patent a necessity is too often ignored in Sunday-School work. The simplified scientific presentation of the facts of child-life ought to go far in helping the teacher to understand his pupil and to stimulate him in adapting his instruction.

The second part is devoted to a discussion of the Teacher or rather of Teaching. It might have been well to have discussed the personality of the teacher and to have shown what qualifications are essential to his success. Perhaps this may be inferred from the excellent discussion of methods. The author takes the true ground when he insists that the principles of instructtion and acquisition which underlie the day-school apply equally to the Sunday-School. The science of teaching embraces the sacred as well as the secular.

This little volume is packed with useful instruction; it bristles with points. A faithful perusal or study of it will help the teacher immensely. We are sure that its circulation among our teachers will result in more efficient work. Pastors, too, will profit by its reading, for pulpit teaching is governed by the same general principles as other instruction.

Dr. Weigle shows a wide acquaintance with his subject and fine skill in its presentation. The numerous quotations from celebrated authors constitute at once a strength and a weakness of the book. They impress one with the author's learning, but break the harmony of style. They are useful as guides to further investigation, but add little to the book as a manual of instruction. The incorporation of the best thought in the author's own excellent language, with proper acknowledgements in the preface, would have made a simpler and better book for the average Sunday-School teacher.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Outlines of Doctrinal Theology. By A. L. Graebner. Price $1.25 postpaid.

The author of this book which is issued in a second edition, was professor in the Concordia Seminary of the Missouri Synod at St. Louis; he died several years ago being yet in the years of

his strength, one of the most talented men the Church of our country has ever had. He taught Doctrinal Theology in English to students who had the leading course of lectures in that branch of theology delivered to them in German. The aim of these English lectures seems to have been to familiarize the students with the English terminology of our Christian doctrines. So an exhaustive treatment was not aimed at. Without intention of their author, through solicitations of the students, these lectures found their way into print, and now a second edition has become necessary. Their form is unique. The author presents each doctrine in a thesis, and analyzes the contents of it by Scripture proofs in which the truth to be substantiated is pointed out by italicized parts of the quoted passages. It is a very useful book. In each instance a finished definition is given, but the reader is constantly invited to examine the Scripture grounds of the definition. It is a book that will win its friends and hold them.

J. L. NEVE.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. By Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B. Paper. Pp. 152. Price 40 cts., postpaid; 10 copies $3.00; 20 copies $5.00; 40 copies $8.00. To subscribers to *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1911, 25 cts.

In this compact pamphlet Mr. Wiener gathers together discussions of various phases of the higher criticism of the Scriptures which he originally contributed to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* the *Churchman,* the *Princeton Theological Review* and other publications. It is a continuation of the searching criticism of the Graf-Wellhausen theory begun in his earlier book "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." The learned author believes that the stone with which to slay this modern Goliath is simply textual criticism. He himself proves a very skillful slinger. The giant may despise his antagonist but he is to be reckoned with. Those who are not wedded to their idols will follow Mr. Weiner's work with increasing interest. The documentary theory is still an open question. No one is justified in closing the case in favor of the critics who has not read the remarkable defense of Moses by this brilliant Jewish barrister.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1911.

ARTICLE I.

ORIGINAL SIN.[1]

BY REV. L. B. WOLF, D.D.

Our churches likewise teach, that since the fall of Adam,all men who are naturally engendered, are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God or confidence towards him, and with sinful propensities: and that this disease, or original sin, is truly sin, and still condemns and causes eternal death to those who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost.

They condemn the Pelagians and others, who deny that natural depravity is sin, and who to the disparagement of Christ's merits and benefits, contend that man may be justified before God by the powers of His own reason. (Book of Worship, Hymns and Tunes. Sixty-third Thousand Edition).

Item docent, quod post lapsum Adae omnes homines, secundum naturam propagati, *nascantur cum peccato,* hoc est, sine metu Dei, sine fiducia erga Deum et cum concupiscentia, quodque hic *morbus* seu *vitium originis* vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque aeternam mortem hic, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum.

Damnant Pelagianos et alios, qui vitium originis negant esse peccatum et, ut extenuent gloriam meriti et beneficiorum Christi, disputant hominem propriis viribus rationis coram Deo iustificari posse. (Symbolischen Buecher Besorgt Von J. T. Mueller,

1 Lecture on Article II of the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., May 2, 1911.

Kirchenrath, Decan und erstem Pfarrer zu Windsbach, Achte Auflage).

Weiter wird bei uns gelehrt, dass nach Adams Fall alle Menschen, so natürlich geboren werden, *in Sünden empfangen und geboren werden,* das ist, dass sie alle von Mutterleibe an voller böser Lust und Neigung sind, und keine wahre Gottesfurcht, keinen wahren Glauben an Gott von Natur haben können; dass auch dieselbige angeborne Seuche und Erbsünde wahrhaftiglich Sünde sei, und verdamme alle die unterm ewigen Gottes Zorn, so nicht durch die Taufe und heiligen Geist wiederum neu geboren werden.

Hieneben werden verworfen die Pelagianer und andere, so die Erbsünde nicht fuer Sünde haben, damit sie die Natur fromm machen durch natürliche Kräfte, zu Schmach dem Leiden und Ferdienst Christi. (Symbolischen Buecher Besorgt Von J. T. Mueller, Kirchenrath, Decan und erstem Pfarrer zu Windsbach, Achte Auflage).

Note 1. A translation of the Latin Editio Princeps: "Also they teach that after Adam's fall all men begotten according to the common course of nature are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with fleshly appetite (concupiscence). And that this disease or original fault is truly sin, condemning and bringing now also eternal death upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost."

Note 2. A translation of the German Editio Princeps: "Further is taught by us that after Adam's fall all men who are naturally born are conceived and born in sin, that is, that they all from (their) mother's womb are full of evil desire and inclination and can have by nature no true fear of God, no true faith in God; that also this self-same inborn plague or birth-sin is truly sin and condemns all under the eternal wrath of God who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost.

Note 3. The "Damnant" clause is the same in the Latin and German editions.

It is sufficient to note in opening this discussion that all discoverable variations in words do not change the main doctrinal position of this Article. What is true here is, in the main, true, of the whole Confession. There are many verbal changes but perhaps with the exception of a fuller statement of the Article on the human will, and an attempt to reconcile conflicting par-

ties on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (notably the Variata of 1540) no very serious doctrinal difference can be discovered. "When the question has a practical interest it is simply because Melanchthon's edition expresses in terms or with greater clearness what is simply implied or less explicitly stated in the other."[2] On the Variatae, both German and Latin, of the noble Augustana the sainted Dr. Richard maintains that, through the hundreds of verbal changes between 1531 and 1558, "In doctrine they do not differ from each other by the breadth of a hair." Again, "Of this, no one can be in doubt for a moment who will compare these Variatae with the Editio Princeps, to say nothing about the German Textus Receptus and the *invariatae*, the same is clarified and strengthened, rendered more pronouncedly Lutheran and more decidedly antithetical to the then current teaching of the Roman Catholic Church."[3] His zeal may have carried him too far, as Melanchthon was disposed to go further in 1540 than is warranted by the Editio Princeps, which he made from "a copy of good credit," on the occasion when he tried to unite the Protestant parties and was satisfied with the Variata, of 1540, for "However true it may be that the formula of the Augustana Variata may be interpreted in a Lutheran sense, it is equally true that it was in reality designed to favor the divergent conception of Melanchthon."[4]

No possible good has resulted nor can result from an attempt to reconstruct a flawless Textus Receptus—a replica of the original Augsburg Confession. The Latin copy was carried away by the Emperor Charles; the German was placed in the archives of the Elector of Mayence, but neither is known to exist today.

Much more to the point is it to show to what we hold fast—the main contentions of the Confession—and to make them live again in the life of the Church. Today we want clear, logical, theological thinking, rather than a war of words as to the origin of any doctrine. The twenty-one doctrinal articles meet the thought of to-day as positively and as negatively as they expressed the Reformers' thought and revealed their position against Rome. But while we are not led by a fixed logical order from one article to another, there can be no question as to the re-

2 Krauth Conservative Reformation, p. 253.
3 The Con. His. of the Luth. Ch., Richard, p. 223.
4 Seeberg, His. Doct., II, 351.

lation of certain articles to each other. Art. II stands in close doctrinal connection with Art. III, "Of The Son of God and His Mediatorial Work," Art. IV, "Of Justification," Art. XII, "Of Repentance," and Art. XVIII, "Of Free-Will." Naturally we would expect Art. XIX, "Of the Cause of Sin," and Art. XVIII, to precede Art. II. But this is a minor question. The essential point is that original sin was touched on so early in the Confession, when at once it marks a departure from Rome. Our confessors were anxious to show existing substantial agreements. Art. II having been promulgated, Rome at once disapproved of it in part as against her teaching.

A helpful method of study would be a careful correlation of those articles which naturally group themselves under one head. As sin is rooted in the human will, we would do well to consider the whole question of the will, so as to grasp clearly the gracious provisions of the Gospel and the high value of the Sacraments, through which God ordained to grant His grace. More and more is it evident that man and his relation to God is the question of the hour, and "that the plan of redemption, which is the essence of Christianity, cannot be rightly understood until the doctrine of sin be adequately recognized and established."[5]

Modern thought is not so much disposed directly to set aside Jesus Christ and His work, as indirectly to give Him a distinctly lower place in human estimation by exalting man and human freedom. The whole trouble with men of the highest light and culture to-day, as well as, with the New Theology, is that they both stumble at the doctrine of sin, and its cause—an impaired will; hence the vital relation between the study of Arts. II and XVIII and XIX. Original sin has no meaning at all if men refuse to admit a degenerate will, the source and the root of all sin. The reason for Christ's coming into the world and for His being nailed to the cross was to bring to naught the counsels of the Prince of this World, whose perverted will held in subjection man, and apparently thwarted the divine purpose in creation.

Let us now give the original setting of this Article. We begin with the error condemned. This is noted as Pelagian but it is far older than Pelagius. It is the tap-root of humanity's error. No more subtle and deadly one ever darkened the human mind. We trace it in the history of the systems of the East and shall see

5 Julius Müller, *On Sin,* Preface.

what the present day thought has to say concerning it, as it is restated in the West.

It is not necessary to do more than to refer to the position of Buddhism. As it has no place for God, it has small place, if any, for sin. It holds that man is the maker of his own way of escape from this present world of misery and entanglement. As a reaction from an older and stronger definite faith, Hinduism, it proclaimed as a cardinal doctrine that of human accountability and responsibility. Man can free himself. Salvation is in his own hands without reference to priest or god. The bondage of sin can be broken in this mortal life. In short, it taught a most thorough-going Pelagianism, long before Pelagius. Buddha was the forerunner of Pelagius, Armenius and the whole tribe of monistic devotees, who have burned incense on humanity's altar from the first. By any of its eight-fold paths, the goal of life, Nirvana, can be reached;—all by the exertion of the best in man. Heaven and all its glories are of man's own making. Hence, away with priestcraft, sacrifice, senseless ritual, penances, gifts and asceticism! Man may have fallen out by the way, may be badly beset by untoward influences of his own and his fellow-man's manufacture; but escape is possible by the noble way of Gautama! This faith failed as it had no clear conception of sin, and still less of God. Brahmanism triumphed because it presented mighty gods, to whom the human soul could cry for help.

Zoroaster follows on the scene. He emphasized evil. The root-elements of his faith are not unlike the Hindus' but he sharply distinguishes the dualistic from the pantheistic view of his rival. Good and evil spirits abound and are in sharp conflict for 12,000 years. The six immortal holy spirits prevail; so does the great saint Zoroaster. But cardinal ideas are so feebly held now, that it is no easy task to discover what this faith has to say in relation to the cardinal doctrine of sin.

Mohammedanism and other forms of the past have little to contribute. Although a monotheism, it taught, as did the generic faith from which it arose, ideas of sin that are worthy of careful study. They throw some light on the origin of sin, but it is largely negative.

Judaism, through the law, taught man's inability both with and without law to attain to perfection; and its inability with

law to present a motive strong enough to help to the highest and best attainments. It only emphasized, as did Mohammedanism later, how easily men fell into the toils of fatalism. No monotheism, however grand and splendid, can satisfy the cry for help which has been raised by most devout hearts in every land and age. Sin recognized, voices itself in its helpless cry for a remedy.

But passing to the old and more subtle form of this error, let us note what Hinduism teaches in her highest form. Two schools of philosophy exist which must be recognized, the Dwita and the Adwita; or dualism and monism. Eastern thought is arrayed in two hostile camps. We cannot discuss the conflict, except as the thought bears upon our discussion. The Adwita philosophy has, in its nature, a direct relation to sin, its origin, cause, and consequences. Of course, if consistent, the consequences of sin should not trouble it, for it has no place for sin in its scope. But we need not expect too much consistency in any form of Hinduism. We shall quote some of the teachings of one of its exponents, Mr. Swami Vivekananda, who expressed his views in the West a few years since. He utters no uncertain sound as to the origin of sin and maintains that the teaching that the soul is imperfect and that its imperfections are due to an impaired will, is no explanation at all. On the declaration of Art. II: "That original sin is really sin," and we are sinners, he breaks out; "Hear ye children of immortal bliss ..... allow me to call you brethren, heirs of immortal bliss, yea, the Hindu refuses to call you sinners!" "Ye are children of God.... Holy and perfect beings!" "Ye divinities on earth, sinners!" "It is a sin to call men so." Thus, negatively, he asserts that man is not a sinner and holds that the Hindu sage gives to his followers complete freedom from all doubt, so that they no longer are subject to the "terrible law of causation." He in the last analysis says; "I have seen the soul; I have seen God. Say not man is a sinner, tell him he is a god. Even if there were a devil, it would be our duty to remember God always and not the devil; 'we are and God is,' and we are Sivoham, Sivoham and march on." Once more, "Good and bad are never two different things, they are one and the same; the difference is not one of kind but of degree."

His arrangement to become identified with God in character is supremely simple. All you need do is "Manifest the divinity

within you, and everything will be harmoniously arranged around you." Neither matter nor body can be your god. To those who would teach that the will is bound by sin, he says: "Silly fools who tell you you are sinners; not so; yourself, the God of the Universe. You are all gods." Only ignorance and delusion, nothing else can bind you. According to the theory of Maya which holds that all matter is illusory (the teaching of thoroughgoing Vedantism) "the idea" is maintained "that the goal of man comes closer and closer, till God in Heaven and Nature becomes one and the God in Nature becomes the God who is Nature, and the God who is Nature becomes the God within this temple of the body, and the God living in this temple of the body becomes the temple itself, becomes the soul and man." God and man thus connote the same.

We must meet this highest form of "self-full" monism. It clothes itself in the garb of the saint. This floodtide of Eastern mysticism and Pantheism has been flowing through the gates of the West. Occultism is popular. Note Christian Science and its vaporings of the same cult which teaches "that everything is mind" or as the Vedantist says: "the Atman equals everything; or God is everything, or everything that is is scientifically mind and what is matter so called is Maya; or does not have a substantial existence. Hence, such a term as disease cannot exist and is unreal." But this after all is only the revamping of the error of a past ethnic faith. It is constantly passing and repassing between the East and the West. Note its recent movement. When it speaks of Christ, it uses the language of Western Unitarianism. Here it as one says of Christ: "But mark this giant, that came. He never talks of this world and this life. We see therefore in the life of this great Messenger of Life that the first watchword is: not this life but something higher. Let us therefore find God, not only in Jesus of Nazareth but in all the great ones that have preceded him; in all that came after him, and in all that are yet to come..... They all bore vicarious atonement for everyone of us."

But this tide of monism does not reach our shores through India's sages alone. It has a more potent channel than this. It began to flow through European scholarship of the great Orientalist, Max Mueller, who drank deep at the fountain of the Vedanta. Latterly, it has found a still greater champion in the

Kiel Professor of Germany, Prof. Deussen, who has practically translated all the Upanashads, the philosophical books of the Hindus. He has summed up their teaching in his monumental works.

It was well that this occultism under the guise of Pelagianism was met in the constructive period of the Church's faith by such a giant as Augustine. It is the corrective of the struggle of the past between Augustine and Pelagius, that the Church needs today. We must follow that struggle to see how to appreciate more fully the setting of the Second Article of the Augustana.

Pelagius from the first held that man had natural moral ability. True he does not break out in the flowing language of the East, but under the influence of Grecian culture, which is in line therewith, he sets forth his view of sin, freedom of the will and grace. Sin is not a moral fault, affecting the whole man; but is, "the result of bad practice." Man begins all right, but is misled and through a long "custom of vices" becomes a confirmed sinner. His error was, that Adam *injured no one but himself and that everyone begins life where Adam did.*

On the contrary, Augustine early taught, as Ambrose, that none is free from original sin, which is the result of a perverse will in man. These radical divergencies struggle for the mastery. Augustine taught that the "Posse non peccare" in Adam and the "Posse non mori," would have become "Non posse peccare" and "Non posse mori." But through Adam's fault came "sin and death, and all our woe, with loss of Eden till one greater man restore us and regain the blissful seat." His views prevailed in the Church. But an ecclesiastical victory for him, did not put an end to Pelagianism. A council cannot do more than declare. The struggle settles certain clear distinctions, embodied in certain phrases in the Church's thought, the true relation of sin and grace, the inability of the will, the absolute necessity of the atonement, and the total depravity and utter sinfulness of human nature. The council at Carthage (418) condemned the following specific Pelagian doctrines: that Adam was created mortal in respect to sin; that children are not subject to original sin, and do not inherit it from Adam; that grace does not help with reference to future sins; that grace consists only in doctrines and commandments; that grace only makes it easier to do good; that saints utter the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer not

for themselves or only from humility. A few years later at Ephesus (431) to the entire satisfaction of the Pope, the council confirmed this rejection of Pelagianism.

But the condemnation and rejection of error do not establish a doctrine. Neither popularly nor generally unequivocally was Augustianism held. Semi-Pelagian and semi- Augustinian views struggled through subsequent years and to the present and will doubtless persist to the end of time.

The Reformation found the question still demanding attention. Rome had not settled it. She held Augustine's views, but they had not been fully received. In 529 at Orange, both Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian views are declared in conflict with "the rule of the Catholic faith." The great Gregory (604) maintained fairly consistent Augustinianism, followed by Anselm later, who taught, notwithstanding his views on the atonement, that the sin must be forgiven by an offended God, as legal ruler, if on no higher ground. Abelard contends for out and out Augustianism. The scholastics of the Middle Ages continued to discuss Augustianian and un-Augustianian views, though perhaps in the main teaching in harmony with the best thought of the past. "We can find no reason to designate it (the teaching of this age) as un-Augustianian."[6] Duns Scotus and the great Thomas Aquinas led in all dialectic discussions; the former and the latter were most active in the discussion of sin and grace; the former surrendering Augustinian views on original sin; the latter setting forth original sin, "as sickness in the body, a state or condition, both that it is a negation and that it is something positive."

This brings us to the Reformation and to Luther. Oppressed by a sense of sinfulness, in view of original sin, it was clear to him that Augustinian views were in harmony with God's Word. The apprehension of man's inability to do what is right, drove him to the root of the matter. "Original sin is the concupiscence, filling the whole man, which is the root of all *peccata actualia.*" His soul was filled with the deepest anguish. His position reveals the standpoint of sin from which St. Paul viewed it; "that what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the

6 Seeberg, Vol. II, 118.

righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Romans 8:3, 4. He used Augustine's phrase: "man is a mass of sin" and he set out to defend these views against the Pelagianism of Rome which manifested itself in a work-righteousness which was sapping the true spiritual life of the Church. Both at Marburg, and subsequently at Augsburg in the Second Article, these views appear, linking, in closest harmony, in the doctrine of the Church, St. Paul, Augustine and Luther in its confession of sin, grace and the will.

The attitude of Rome may be seen from a summary on Article II after the Diet at Augsburg;[7] the second, of Original Sin, is approved in part, namely, in that original sin is truly sin; in part not, namely, in that they say that original sin is to be without the fear of God and without trust in God, and it is concupiscence, which remains in children after baptism. In our Apology the strictures of Rome are met. It maintains, "That by his own natural powers no man is able to fear God nor trust Him." The sophists and scholastics err alike; the former "define what original sin is as a defect in the body," and the latter pass over in silence, "this active hereditary contagion by which our whole nature is corrupted, by which we all inherit such hearts.... as are immediately opposed to God." On the question of baptism and its effect on original sin our Apology squarely meets Rome, holding that while "Holy baptism extirpates and removes the *entire guilt* and *hereditary debt* of original sin; the material as they call it of sin, namely the evil propensity and lust, remain."

We can only touch on the subject of our Church's teaching in relation to Roman Catholics and Protestants; but it is vital to do so. At Trent (1545) Rome sets forth her teachings. She maintains a hostile attitude against downright Pelagianism and taught that the first man lost righteousness and holiness and fell under God's wrath, and the power of the devil—became degenerate in the whole man; yet that free will was not extinguished, only weakened in its power and perverted. Further "the sin and guilt of Adam affected mankind by propagation not by imitation." Man cannot release himself therefrom. Baptism regenerates children and its imputed benefits work forgiveness, although concupiscence, the tinder of evil, remains, which while sometimes called sin the Church maintains must not be so con-

7 Following Cochlaeus.

strued.[8] It anathematizes all who teach that baptism is not necessary to salvation and maintains much advanced views on original sin over those which it urged against the Augsburg Confession, though much harrassed by the various difficulties in which her system of faith in works and in work-righteousness, as well as her views on grace and free-will, involved her.

The Calvinistic system agrees with the Lutheran on the doctrine of sin; but when it comes to the remedy it breaks with her on the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism. "Every sin" this rigid system holds, "both original and actual, brings guilt upon the sinner and he is so made subject to death with all its miseries, spiritual, temporal and eternal." Because of the doctrine of election, Pagans, Mohammedans, Jews and infants are lost by the general teaching on original sin, unless elected; and if elected there is no need for baptism as an ordinary means of grace. In regard to infants our confessors teach that they are saved by God's gracious laver of baptism and the Holy Ghost, while the Calvinist tells us they are saved by Christ through the Spirit, who "worketh when, where and how he pleaseth." While the Baptists set the divine ordinance aside as unnecessary for children, because of inadequate or wrong ideas of faith; the Calvinist empties it of its efficacy, and falls back on the same general idea for their salvation, as the former,—leaves them to a merciful God and their "personal innocence" or election. Accepting God's grace in the Word and Sacrament, the Lutheran is consistent, while the Calvinist denies, because of his doctrine of election, the place which baptism ought to hold; and the Baptist reasons that only man's faith can make a divine ordinance efficacious; and so denies the infant's right to it. We can only wonder at such narrow assertion of human reason in the midst of such wealth of divine grace in Word and Sacrament.

It will be no surprise to anyone that Zwingli followed Pelagius. We note, however, that at Marburg, he agreed to the Article on Original Sin; but poor theologian that he was, he fell into the common error that sin is in the character of the deed, not in the "essence of the moral nature, that originates the deed."[9] He constantly illustrates this and confuses both the cause and the effect in the most thoroughgoing Pelagian fashion. To him

8 Abbreviated from Seeberg, II, 432, 433.
9 Krauth, Con. Ref. p. 449.

"original sin is not sin but a disease" and he continues "what could be more alien to scripture than to say that this calamity is alleviated by the laver of baptism." "Original sin does not merit damnation."[10] "It cannot in reason be so regarded, because it is only a defect derived by man from birth without his own fault." But he ought to have remembered that the "shattering force of original sin precludes all possibility of self-deliverance."[11]

The thirty-nine articles hold to strict Augustinianism.[12] The twenty-five articles of the Methodist Church are largely based on these, but the influence of other doctrines greatly modify the Methodist position on original sin.

It would be an easy matter to trace the course of Pelagianism through the many forms it has assumed in Protestantism. Weak and unscriptural views on sin have been maintained just in proportion as teachers have held rationalistic views on the doctrine of man. It matters little, whether they studied Pelagian or monistic or semi-Pelagian authorities, they generally reach one conclusion on the doctrine of sin and grace. Whenever they begin to reckon on the character of original sin and its consequences, they begin to empty the sacraments of their efficacy as channels of divine grace, and render the death of Christ as of little effect, and His Person as at best only a superior man. Rationalism is the fruitful ground of bold self-determination, and self-determination cannot abide such an idea, as that man is helpless and undone without God's grace in Jesus Christ. Self-pride and reliance on human powers assert themselves. They can make man what he ought to be. Monism says the same, and neither needs a divine redeemer.

We shall briefly analyze the teaching of Article II under four

10 Book on Baptism (Zwingli).

11 Seeberg, II, 309.

12 Article IX. "Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (As the Pelagians do vainly talk) but it is the fault and the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam.....and therefore in every person born into this world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lusts of the flesh, called in the Greek *phronama sarkos,* which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

main theses or propositions. We deem it unnecessary and hardly fruitful of much good to enter into a minute analysis as some have done.[13] We emphasize the fundamental distinction between the sin of origin and the consequences thereof; between *peccatum originalis and peccatum actuale* or *wirkliche sünde.* Every act in conflict with the will and law of God on the part of man has its root in original sin and manifests itself in its hateful, hydra-headed forms in human life, in actual sins in all its dreary varieties from venial to mortal sins.

No proper doctrine of man can be held without admitting this sin of birth. The doctrine posits the entire estrangement of the human race from God, and hence demands in view thereof and man's consequent inability to get right with God, a scheme of universal salvation:—all have sinned—all must be provided with a remedy from sin. It is well to remember the solidarity of the race in this two-fold connection. "As in Adam all die even so in Christ shall all be made alive."(I Cor. 15:22.) Sound anthropologic views demand this position and a close study of the race cannot but help to strengthen the same, that all men have sinned through the first man. Thetically stated then, the Second Article teaches as follows:

1. That since Adam all men begotten in the flesh are conceived in and born in sin, variously called birth-sin, original sin, *erbs sünde* or *peccatum originalis,* and this state is the most stubborn and universal fact of human knowledge, co-extensive with the race and that it is so by natural propagation.

2. That this sin shows itself, *negatively* in all men by (1) A want of fear of God, (2) A want of trust in Him (*Und keine wahre Gottes furcht, keinen wahren Glauben on Gott von Natur haben können;* that they all can have no true fear of God and no true faith in Him from their mother's womb); and *positively,* that they all "are born with sin, that is, with concupiscence," or with "*seuche und erbsünde*" (plague and hereditary sin); or "*an voller böser Lust und Neigung*" (full of evil desire and inclination).

3. That the character of this sin is such as to condemn all under God's wrath and bring now also eternal death upon all.

4. That the ordinary and normal way to escape from the fearful consequences of this sin is by being born again, (or from

13 See Krauth, Con. Ref., p. 363.

above) which is wrought in men by baptism and the Holy Ghost.[14]

These four propositions comprehend sufficiently the teaching of the Second Article. We may also note that the thought of the Latin and German editions of our Confession is one; and though numerous verbal variations exist, they cannot unsettle our faith any more than the various readings of the Holy Scriptures can. According to the Reformation principle no one of these theses could stand, could it be shown to be contrary to the Word of God. In the Apology a complete vindication of this Article is found, while in the Formula of Concord its scripturalness is maintained. The questions which arose against it are satisfactorily answered, and the whole doctrine is set forth in so clear a light as to place it beyond dispute in the teaching of the Church.

The first proposition maintains that original sin began with Adam and is propagated by him to his descendants and since his day to all men. "No sin in created man is to be found prior to the fall in Eden; nothing but sin in the generated man, while unregenerated, after."[15] Adam opened the floodgates and since then "the tragedy of God's universe" has from age to age unfolded its ugly scenes in a world of misery and woe. All men in all times are the inheritors of his sin. In him an entail was laid on the whole race, from the effects of which no one can escape. He began with a nature stainless, though unconfirmed in righteousness. He ended in possessing a nature from which sin cannot be said to be absent in its effects though man may get beyond its power through divine grace and may successfully cry: "O death, where is thy sting..... Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." "So death passed upon all men for that all have sinned." (Romans 5:12). It is not a question, how he could originate sin; or how having originated it, he was destined to be the bearer of it to and through all his seed. This is the difficulty of the subject. At this point we only emphasize the inevitable fact of sin's existence and its transmission to all the race. We cannot stop now

14 The translation of this Article in the last edition of the Book of Worship (H. and T.) is as follows:—"Also they teach that since the fall of Adam, all men begotten according to nature are born with sin, that is without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence. And that this disease or vice of origin is truly sin, even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon all those not born again through baptism and the Holy Ghost."

15 Dr. Sprecher, First Series, p. 43.

to attempt to justify the existence therof, either with the goodness or justice of God. This endeavor must be made later. The clear teaching of Scripture and the universal testimony of conscience cannot be doubted. We must all confess with Luther: "Original sin is the real and chief sin; if there were not that, there were no actual sins..... It does all other sins and is the essential sin." For as death is universal so is sin, its source: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin." (Rom. 5:12). They who argue from science, that nature indicates that death was to be its goal irrespective of sin, argue, without remembering that all nature which they now study because of sin "groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." All men even those that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression (who had not sinned consciously as did he) are under sin and death's dominion. If all men, then none are excepted as it is a sin of birth, and not actuality, of which our confessors speak, for by propagation infants as well as adults come under the dominance, as of death, so of sin. This is St. Paul's argument. Or again, "We all (the Jews) are by nature children of wrath even as others." (The Gentiles). Eph. 2:3. By *usus loquendi,* the phrase "Jews and Gentiles" embrace all men, engendered since the fall of Adam. It boots not an iota whether we can explain it or not. The proper philosophy of the doctrine of sin, by which to satisfactorily account for it, is vastly different from the universal fact thereof by natural propagation. Were it needed to make this clearer, we might dwell on the universal need of a Saviour, for whom a race cries; and whose awful lament of no release from the sphere of nature goes up as impossible, except through supernatural intervention.

But to answer one of the subtlest errors of the race, that we become sinners by imitation, the Confession points to the Scriptural proof that sin is transmitted through heredity by natural propagation, which continues always and ever the fault of Adam in all his descendants. "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me." (Ps. 51:5). We must insist upon this terrible fact. No refinement of philosophy can permit us to forget it. Sin is ugly. An appeal to high ideals as revealed in some great souls in every nation cannot alter the fact. Those who have tried to explain it away and make it out con-

trary to God's plan are compelled to admit that sin is "The power of all sinful results and the seed of all sinful growths," flowing from parent to child and claiming in its dark flow misery and death, temporal and eternal. It matters not under what suns it throws up its ugly foam; it matters not in what race, cultured or savage, it lifts its ugly head, it works everywhere the same. It spoils the choicest soul, it proves sadly yet certainly, that the race is one in origin, for it is touched by this common innate disease—corrupt are they all; "The Lord looked down from Heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that did understand and seek God; they are all gone aside....There is none that doeth good, no not one." (Ps. 14). Fearing lest this might be deemed strained exegesis, it is well to read it with St. Paul's argument. Such a universal declaration of man's sinfulness is supported both by the Scriptures and by the history of the race. We cannot explain it on any other theory than that of an original fault, and the weakening the whole race through natural generation from the beginning.

The need to emphasize this fact was never more insistent than to-day. Since Spinoza declared that "Good and evil, or sin, are only modes of thought, and by no means things, or anything that has reality," followed by Hegel, that "All sin is relatively good" in itself; "sin is a mere appearance," there has been a fine following of both philosophers and others! The New Theology, belittling sin, amounts to the same thing. One more friendly to Christianity has also expressed himself more subtilely; and has caught the popular favor, through his Ritschlism, Sir Oliver Lodge. He writes: "As for original sin or birth-sin or other notion of that kind,—by which is partly meant the sin of his parents,—that sits absolutely lightly on him (the higher man of to-day). As a matter of fact it is non-existent and none but a monk could have invented it. Whatever it be, it is not a business for which we are responsible. We did not make the world; and an attempt to punish us for our animal origin and ancestry would be simply comic, if anyone could be found who was seriously willing to believe it."[16] But Kant, neither monk nor theologian, long before Lodge dealt his lively and hard blow against original sin, declared: "That there must be such a corrupt propensity rooted in man is not in need of formal proof in the face

16 Man and the Universe, p. 220.

of the multitude of crying examples which experience sets before one's eyes in the acts of men."[17]

Nor would we expect here that Huxley would come to the help of the theologian, yet he comes bravely to his rescue and considers the theological teachers superior to their opponents, because the former emphasize the realities of original sin, innate depravity of the race and the primacy of Satan in this world. These ideas are nearer the truth than those popular views, "that babes are born good and that the example of a corrupt society is responsible for their failure to remain so; that the ethical ideal can be reached, if only one try; that all partial evil is universal good; and that providence is a partial philanthropist and bids us believe that everything will come out right at last."[18] Though it is not so directly on the question of original sin yet his views on hell ought to make his admirers pause.[19] It is hence certain that the universal fact cannot be denied by raising philosophical difficulties on the question of its origin, inheritableness and baseness. The only question that can be asked is, "Are these wrong tendencies," call them ape and tiger, or whatever you please, sin? The facts of human nature witnessed to by every age, permit only one answer, the one referred to in the whole course of Scripture from the Eden story to the close of the Revelation; and summed up in the race out of Christ or apart from Christ. "Let him that is filthy be filthy still."

Wherein that sin consists both negatively and positively our Confession amply shows in the second proposition stated, want of fear and want of trust, (*keine fiducia,* or *keine wahre Gottes furcht und keinen wahren Glauben an Gott*). The fear here meant is not that slavish perverted state of the heathen world, but is the want of a reverential awe, a failure to appreciate an infinite God. This led them to the qualifying term 'true.' The want of faith is the breach of that real relationship which ought to exist be-

17 Kant's Theory of Ethics, p. 339.

18 Abbreviated from Life and Letters, pp. 303, 304.

19 He says: "I am a strong believer in the punishment of certain kinds of action, not only in the present but in all the future a man can have, be it long or short. Therefore in hell, for I suppose that all men have a clear sense of right and wrong—and I am not sure that any others deserve such punishment—have now and then descended into hell, and stopped there quite long enough to know what infinite punishment means. And if a genuine, not merely subjective, immortality awaits us, I conceive that, without some such change as that depicted in the 15th Chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, immortality must be eternal misery.

tween God and man. This want of faith shows itself in a lack of trust in God both as Father and loving Creator. 'True' is here used because again the heathen world is full of false faiths, not to mention the fatalistic faith of the false prophet. The teaching of the Confession is that the descendant is not only without these true relations, but that he has not the power to exercise them. Faith being of God, no one can exercise it unless born again, unless the motions thereof are started from without, from God. These two negative elements are determinative of the character of man. Out of proper relation, expressed by this phrase, can lead to only one state, that is, one without true reverence toward God, whose allegiance had been repudiated by Adam in his fall. Want of fear shows itself in pride, and want of faith, in that sense of the sufficiency of human reason.

But besides these privative elements, the result of original sin, our theses hold *positively* that all men are born with concupiscence (*et cum concupiscentia*). What our confessors meant by the use of this word is made clear from the fuller statement in the German; "An voller böser Lust und Neigung." "Epithumia" may mean desire in a good sense, but it also and in most connections in the Scripture means the natural desire, inordinate, carnal, sensual, impure, or lust. Hence in this lust or evil desire lies potentially the very essence of sin, which soon manifests itself in sinful acts and an unholy life. This condition then has infected or corrupted man. As the Formula of Concord says: "The whole nature of man is entirely and to the farthest extent corrupted and perverted by original sin in body and soul." St. Paul refers to this also: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God." (I Cor. 2:14), and "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the Law of God neither indeed can be." (Romans 8:7). He clearly teaches that man is unable without fear and faith to attain unto the destiny which God intended for him and which God has made possible only in Christ Jesus.

But our third proposition holds that the character of this sin is such as to condemn all to death, temporal and eternal. All are under the curse of the Law, whether born under the Law or without the Law. This sin is treated as a most deadly disease from whose consequences there is no possible escape in the course of nature, and as a moral vice or fault which involves all under di-

vine wrath and brings about eternal death to all who remain under its dominion. Disease in man is an abnormal condition. Such is his who is without fear and faith. Temporal death ensues from disease; moral fault (vitium) condemns to punishment under law and leaves to banishment eternal from the glory of God and His presence, against whom the wrong has been done. The meaning of the language is clear. No remedy can be found in man. Original sin bears hence all the marks of actual sin and in addition is real sin in the deadly sense that out of it flows all manner of sin.

Here may appropriately be asked the question at what stage does the new-born infant become a sinner; or when and how soon does the child's sin become conscious sin? Or again, it may be asked, if sin lies in the will how can a child sin at its birth? Is it true that Adam's voluntary act cannot bind anyone but himself? We may admit that this question involves a real difficulty. But this arises from a failure to apprehend on the one hand Adam's position in the race as its federal head and on the other his organic connection in view of its solidarity. Both the guilt and penalty of sin are entailed on succeeding generations. This is an admitted fact. However it may appear it is all involved in the race. Hard as it may be to explain, it is no more difficult than to explain the hardship involved in the violation of physical and sanitary laws by man. We are involved in their violation and in the consequences thereof, though we may show clearly that we have no part in that violation. E. G. Consider the spread of smallpox, plague or cholera, in a city, due largely to unsanitary conditions. Thousands suffer who have every right to be immune. This is the debt we pay to the solidarity of the race.

As to just when, how soon, and how the responsibility of the child begins, it is not easy to reply and is largely a matter of speculation. As it is, too, to say when soul-life starts. Pre-existent theories settle nothing more than that souls exist somewhere and are joined to the new bodies and come laden with their sin-guilt from previous existences. Hindus and many of our poets entertain these views by which to account for sin on a rational basis; and save God from this seeming implication of being its author, should souls be created *de novo* every time a child is born. The theories of creationism and traducianism are both held. We may admit that neither explains to any great extent the difficulty, or

prevents the implication. They only anticipate the more difficult question, why at all sin was permitted in God's universe. If souls are created, it would, on the surface, appear to make them more directly owe their origin to God, than if they in some mysterious way became involved in sin in the act of propagation. But as cells of generation contain all possibilities for the future body, it would seem no more difficult to conceive, that they might quite as readily contain all the possiblities of soul-life, which is so mysteriously contained in the body. Hence there would seem scientifically to be no need for the direct creation at all of souls; and traducianism contains the more tenable theory.

It is refreshing to turn away from this dark picture of an apostate race, plunged into the deep sea to which there appears no surf-beaten shore, and to pass to the last thesis full of hope and cheer, to consider the Light Divine, and the remedial agencies of a gracious father; that the normal way of escape from the fearful consequences of this sin and all sin, proceeding from it, is by being born again, or from above, wrought in man by baptism and the Holy Ghost. In this is involved infant salvation and a flood of light is thrown on the difficult subject as to the part the human will has in bringing the descendant of Adam just born, under the curse and dominion, guilt and penalty of original sin. We are not as a Church troubled with rationalistic theories of salvation. If a child as the Confession so plainly teaches, can become a sinner through the parental act; and from birth be subject to the divine wrath and be condemned to death; so in the gracious provisions of God's plan, through the ordinance of baptism and the operations of the Holy Ghost, the new birth commences and the grace of the Gospel begins to work without an act of the will on the child's part. Our children are offered to God in Holy Baptism and are received into His gracious favor. The mark of the King is theirs, and His faith and power are implanted. The subtle power of the destroyer is, through divine grace, broken. This thesis teaches, that the Holy Ghost operates on the enslaved will, and through water and the word of baptism, brings about that regenerating change, by which sin's dominion is broken. The phrase "born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost" deserves much fuller consideration than our space will allow. To my mind it contains to a large extent the answer to all the difficulties which the whole question

of sin raises. God does not wait till man signifies his readiness to accept his Spirit and gracious plan; but in Holy baptism He comes and works in us that change which breaks the bondage of original sin and starts man back to God from whom original sin separates him. Our confessors' view of baptism, as the ordinary means through which the Holy Ghost works, saves the doctrine of the Church from the extreme emphasis which Rome places on the external rite, and from the views of Baptists and all others, who more or less agree with them, that baptism is not a vehicle of grace, but only an external sign, symbol and seal of an invisible grace. The Baptists err, by ignoring God's means of grace; and the others by minimizing the same. All who empty the Sacrament of its gracious mediation of the Holy Ghost's regenerating power, err together, whether they refuse to baptize infants, or baptize only, because of their theory. Charity compels us to admit that God's grace is not always given according to our theories. The soundness of our position rests on the connection of the ordinance with the Word and the operation of the Holy Ghost. We leave it to others to prove that He, the third person of the adorable Trinity, will not choose effectively to work through a divinely appointed means rather than to hold the theory confessed by so many, that He can work "when, where and how he please, according to His gracious will." We believe we can hold logically both the latter and the former. As the infant presents no conscious obstacle to the reception of divine grace so far as we can understand, we may safely hold that it cannot voluntarily prevent the inflow of grace into its nature, and begins, under the power of the Holy Ghost the true life of faith, when and as soon as it consciously recognizes itself, and apprehends the knowledge of God's gracious plan. But the apprehension of the gracious plan in no sense is necessary to the infant's salvation. It is all of grace. God does not wait till the child consciously believes to bless and regenerate, save and cleanse it from original sin, but, according to the divine plan, works faith in the child through baptism by the Holy Ghost; and delivers from the curse of Adam's sin and guilt, under which the child lay by nature, and so too without baptism the merits of its life and atonement work efficaciously in all those infants, who die in a great heathen world unbaptized. This is God's mystery of

grace to meet the mystery and tragedy of sin in His universe, and thanks be unto Him for it!

Our confessors wisely do not press the saving efficacy of baptism in children to such an extent as that the child cannot sin after the divine favor has been secured through the gracious act. The Church urges that it be not neglected, as God's plan; it does not say that all are lost who are not baptized. It does not hold that baptism is *essential* to salvation,—only *necessary*. To hold the former would limit God, and make Him subject to His own declared means to save the world and all men. This would not be consistent with the divine prerogatives.

The relation of the doctrine discussed to the theory of evolution and its teaching on heredity, must claim some attention. It might be passed by with the general remark that the spheres of science and religion do not cover the same ground. It could be easily shown that this contains a truth, but also, by no means, the whole truth. Science and religion do deal with separate facts to a large extent; but they also have to do with the origin of life and especially in its higher forms, and so they constantly meet, act and react on each other. It is true that the processes of science, especially in a downright naturalism, have little to do with religion, and, too often, care less for it. Its specialists are seeking for explanations of the natural world, of its central phenomenon, life. If their theories seem satisfactory, they do not care how they may affect religion. It is the business of religion to square its theories and teachings, they would say, with the approved teaching of science. This sounds fair, as religion says nature and God cannot write two separate hands. Nature's processes are God's and God's are seen in the varied forms of nature, through His manifold laws.

Again, we must be honest and acknowledge that too often the theologian has been indifferent, if not antagonistic, to what he claims is a godless science. He holds that each has its separate sphere, that naturalism, and all it stands for, cannot, in the very nature of the case, enter the realm of the ethical and spiritual. Their domain cannot be studied as can nature and her processes. New ethical standards, the phenomena of the spiritual world, man's willing and determining, cannot be examined in the laboratory of the chemist. All the possibilities of the crown of creation, man, and all his varied steps since he appeared, furnish

a field of study, which the candid scientist generally admits, lies wholly outside the sphere of his observations, though he does know that the greatest mystery of nature is himself, who is trying to discover her secrets. We can do no more in this connection however, than simply to state the relations of these spheres. When science attempts to set up a rational explanation of nature, that is, one that takes into its perview, life in all inorganic and organic forms or organisms, and when it sets forth such a theory as denies all outside, external interference, either at some remote beginning, or at some later stages in the process of evolution, then naturally it becomes a question of interest to all thinking men. But does it attempt such explanation by its theories? Let us hear it speak.

A thorough-going evolution—the teaching of Darwin's pangenesis, nature working through gemmules; or Wiesmann's more subtle " performation theory" of "determinants," the directive principle of organisms; or Haeckel's perigenesis of the "plastidules"; or Driesch's attempts to advance upon all these by extracting the good from each,—in fine, the whole study of the "Mechanical" theory of the universe by which is taught that without the organism there is no fundamental force working according to a definite idea, ("It arises in obedience to the blind laws of necessity")[20]—in all these is a challenge thrown down to the older "vitalistic" theory of origin. A universe is made possible thus, including man, by processes of development, or morphogenesis, without God in any way being necessary.

Where such a theory touches man it touches our subject. If man is an evolution, pure and simple, by gradual steps, through thousands of years, if he moves on toward a perfection under the impulse of"natural selection," "definite variation," "elective affinities," and the "struggle for existence," how did sin enter into the world? It is little wonder that these scientists talk about the Eden story being a myth.[21] A flat contradiction is given to religion and religious conceptions by a thorough-going naturalistic evolution. But it is more apparent than real, for we may ask, can science settle anything in regard to sin as we know it? Does it lie within its province? We answer it cannot. Here the spheres do not touch. A mechanical and naturalistic theory of

20 According to Schwann.
21 For full discussion see Naturalism and Religion, Otto.

things may thoroughly justify itself "as a method" for the study of scientific phenomena and as helping "to an understanding of these." But "it is indeed justifiable, only so long as it does not profess to reveal the true nature of things, but remains conscious of the free spirit, whose whole work and undertaking the whole is." "We must reject in great measure the claims which naturalism makes upon our domain, and maintain that the most important starting points for the higher view are to be found in the priority of everything spiritual over everything material, in the underivability of the spiritual and the impossibility of describing it in corporeal-mathematical terms and concepts."[22] Is there then no possible reconciliation between these two domains? It cannot be that we need exclude the beneficint working of each in a right rationalism. Science admits difficulties in its theory of evolution. It cannot move on in gradual sequences from the inorganic to the organic and from the organic to its highest form —man, without admitting abrupt, "indefinite and insensible steps," "leaps," "lifts" or "breaks"; and if this is true in the realm of the lower natural, what may we not expect in her higher reaches in man? He must be explained in his feeling, willing and ethical and spiritual life.

But science and religion agree that there are mysteries in life's origin and development which nothing has yet explained. Science may claim that man has arisen, physically and mentally, by gradual steps through countless ages, "existing in semi-brutishness and savagery," but bound to develop according to evolutionary laws to his perfect stature, without a creative cause in the beginning, or anywhere in the course of his upward march. But she cannot hold this with any more reason than human history holds that the existence of sin allows a possible sinless development, had man not wilfully departed from his relationship to God, antagonized his moral and spiritual universe by exercising his highest prerogative of personality, his right of self-determination,—became consciously an alien and lost the divine image in which he was created. It is no wonder that so thorough-going a scientist as Driesch is compelled in his last work to dwell on the impossibilities of the "mechanical theories from the domain of vital processes to pass into that of behavior and voluntary action." He rejects sharply the naturalism of the

22 Otto, Naturalism and Religion, p. 297.

Darwin School; "The absurd assumption of a contingent of morphogenesis" and declares in favor of "external agents," to effect transformations which are adaptive to ends "capable of life." He points out the impossibility of eliminating a "causal and teleological" element in the study of nature. In short, *nature* needs for ultimate explanation just what *history* does—*A First Cause, and a Moral Personal Creator.* Mechanical evolution cannot predicate such an one and remain consistent. The fault of origin is a mighty break in the realm of the spiritual and about it evolution is silent.

In this line then, it is easy to pass to that other doctrine of science, which however, is also one of religion,—the doctrine of heredity. The origin of the world cannot be understood without a great purpose, nor can the purposeful moral universe find an adequate solution, nor chief of all man, without a moral and purposeful Creator. The world and all therein demands this. The human race and sin in that race, demands the same. Both positions can be maintained with reasonable assurance, providing both are willing to make serious and honest admission of the vast region of the *incognita.* When these admissions are made science, as it views humanity as willing, personal and spiritual, as well as religion, will ask the question, what will account for this defection from the Creator's benign purpose?

For when the scientist begins to study into the higher reaches of nature he must discover what religion discovered and revelation declared from the first,—the work of a law of development that every organism follows the parental type "in all its morphological and physiological characters down to the most intimate details, physically."[23] Revelation declares the same truth; "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations," thus passing into the sphere of the moral and spiritual, in the outworking of the same great law. The scientists have been trying to find how this heredity works itself out in nature. They have admitted the fact and some account for everything, the specific type and all the variations thereof, on the ground that they are contained in the hereditary tendency of the organism. Here the fiercest battle has been waged around the question of so-called "acquired characters." All agree that congenital variations may be inherited, but many con-

23 Otto, Naturalism and Religion, p. 211.

tend that acquired characters are not. Spencer, Lamarck and Darwin supported this theory. Professor Thomson maintains that "A right answer to the question underlies right beliefs, not only in biology and psychology, but also in education, ethics and politics." We are honestly faced with this alternative: "Either there has been inheritance of 'acquired characters' or there has been no evolution."[24] Scientific heredity would cut away the ground from the doctrine of original sin, if it could show that a hereditary vitiation of nature, or evil tendencies, as the result of our ancestors, are not transmissable. Such tendencies would naturally fall under the scientists' definition of "acquired characters." But following out this view, it is maintained, with good authority, that such transmission of "acquired characters" must be proved.[25] But we must remind the scientists that in the transmission of moral and spiritual tendencies, we are not reckoning with plastic germ cells and "gemmules," but with free-will, personality, intellectual and religious verities,—with man, willing and self-determinative, able to direct his steps; and made so by a wise Creator.

But after all that can be said, heredity remains "a terrible reality in life," and coupled with environment lands us in gloomy pessimism, "the devil's church," unless the situation is relieved by the redeeming forces of a gracious Father. It is hence clear that when rightly interpreted the domain of science and religion are here co-terminous. But we cannot stop as did science in general with the naked theory of heredity; we must, with Driesch and others, follow on through nature to man, its highest form; and then on to God, an intelligent, purposeful, merciful, originator of all things and man. God made man free, to choose good or evil, with a bias for the former; but man chose the latter and thus vitiated the whole course of natural propagation, affecting man physically, mentally, morally and spiritually. Heredity can only help to show the fact of evil transmission. It cannot explain, much less, justify that fact. The ways of God to man are full of mysteries, or as science admits and calls them "riddles"; and nowhere do they deepen so much as on this question of sin and its entrance into the fair creation of God.

The difficulties which beset such a subject as original sin are

24 Orr, Sin as a Problem of To-day, p. 207.
25 Tennant, Hulsen Lectures on Origin and Propagation of Sin.

many and serious. Bound up as it is with the question of the freedom of the will, accountability and responsibility, it is difficult to escape the rocks on which shipwreck have been made in the past by thousands. If sin originates in the will, in Adam's will, if it is propagated in the course of nature, if it involves in moral accountability, in physical and moral death, and if it condemns to eternal death, it is easy to see what questions are bound to arise. We can only hint at some and indicate briefly such answers as may at least satisfy to a certain extent. We may, however, preface what we have to say, by stating that all our difficulties arise through mental, moral and spiritual limitations. All of these difficulties belong rather to speculative than didactive theology.

If sin is the result of individual willing, how can Adam's act affect us? All must admit that sin originates in the will of the individual. But it may help us somewhat to remember that we belong to *a race* quite as much as that we are individuals of that race; and while Adam's sin originates all sin, original and actual, in his descendants, he does not stand in the same relation as his first or any subsequent descendants did. We would not get much comfort out of this were it not for the fact that the second Adam occupies the same position in grace, as the one through whom without our individual act of will, grace becomes ours, through the grace which a gracious God imparts to the sinner. And the advantage is on the side of grace as St. Paul argued. True, all become partakers of Adam's sin and guilt. "But not as is the offense, so also is the free gift, for if through the offense of one may be dead, *much more* the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded to many." (Romans 5:15). This helps us to understand something of the divine process, for if this process is opened to criticism because of the transmission of sin, ought it not fail also in the matter of grace? But no one can find reasonable fault with the gracious provisions to help mankind out of the entanglement of Adam. It should modify hence any criticism against the constitution of the human race as we find it by which all are involved, as all must admit, in Adam's fall. Racial solidarity involves joint responsibility. Continuity of sinning is met by a similar continuity of blessing the race.

Again, it is most difficult to conceive how a race that had ac-

corded to it free moral agency could have developed in any other way than it has. "When we find fault we do not see that evolution and self-realization and freedom, are more worthy of praise than ready-made existence incapable of independent action."[26] We admit that potentially we were born in Adam. This the highest science teaches, as we have seen. This is true not only of the body, but as generally admitted, of the soul,—both alike involved in the divine will to create, when God said, "Let us make man in our own image." But if there be ground to criticise the seeming unfairness of an involved and imputed sin and guilt from Adam, if we "see and blame its mistakes, for instance in our own structure," if we recognize "the deficiencies in the historical course of things," does not the real criticism in any and all cases lie rather against God's having created man at all as He did; or having created him to have permitted him to fall? And is not all such criticism on the part of the creature vain and presumptuous? But having recognized that God created man a free moral agent, we must hold that he could not have prevented him from falling. This does not limit God but simply recognizes the implication of what is involved in freedom of choice. If in addition it can be shown that man was not only as likely to go on to confirm his righteousness as to sin, but also more likely as he was made with bias for the good, so that his power of self-determination is the crown of the creative act, it is hard to see that there is any injustice in the implication of the race in Adam's sin and guilt. This seems more rational, when we remember too, that the "riddle of theodicy" is due to the fact that "what surrounds us in nature and history has not come direct from the hand of eternal wisdom, but is in the first place the product of the developing, striving world which only gradually and after many mistakes and failures, works out what is inherent in it as eternal idea and aim."[27] This is especially so since we cannot well conceive, in the last analysis, that there is any more outstanding fact in the universe, than the clear steady purpose of God to do what will insure man's highest good.

If, of course, we interpret divine knowledge as equal to predestination, and hold that if as God did certainly know, so His knowledge involves the certainty of the fall, then the dark case

26 Otto, Naturalism and Religion, p. 366.
27, Otto, Naturalism and Religion, p. 366.

only becomes darker. But we cannot admit for a moment the fact that God knew that man would fall, brought it about; we must believe of creation as of grace, that God's infinite love is as much involved in the one as in the other, and that God made man a free moral agent for His highest and best ends, and for man's highest good. No one can explain it to anyone's entire satisfaction, but "where sin did abound, grace did much more abound." Any other view would make God out a monster, that He chose to create as He did to show His power, and that He permitted sin to enter His fair creation, that He might exhibit yet more of His mighty power, toward the race. This would end us in a chain of fatalism and make us mere playthings of a mighty God. We can only repeat that love is shown as much in a creation that involves man as a free moral agent, with all the terrible possibilities of the fall, as in the gracious remedy to make possible man's escape from the consequences of the fall. It is easy to see how all difficulties gather around this main one. If God saw fit to create at all, after a single plan, if he set His mark on that creation in its highest form by making man a free agent, like unto Himself, if this He did out of His full and perfect knowledge of what He regarded as Man's highest good, as one who is love Himself, we may safely rest all our fears and doubts with Him, whose purpose is no more powerful than perfect and whose will is no more set on human creation than on a human creation, which shall reveal Himself as a God of Love.

If God has provided hence a remedy for this terrible fall of the race which man incurred by electing his own way, is it not natural for us to expect that it should be one that runs ahead of man's act, which in mercy meets him, which begets in him by baptism and the Holy Ghost, "according to His mercy by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," (Titus, 3:5), a new soul or new movements toward recovery? Not mechanically is this done, but according to God's gracious provision, through the ordinary means of baptism and the Holy Ghost, working effectually through that means. After all this simply means that God honors His own ordinance, magnifies His great mercy, and the merits and sacrifice of His Son, through whose life and death the ordinance has become a fit channel of grace.

But this does not affect those who lived before the coming of

Christ and those who have died and are dying in heathen darkness, since Christ came. What shall we say of them? Can we dare attempt the justification of God's ways toward them? Is there any theodicy that will satisfactorily explain the difficulties involved? We must answer, only partial glimpses of light appear in this dark picture. We can only fall back on the great Truth; that the judge of all the earth will do right by them, that those who live without the law and die without the law, shall be judged without the law; that the Scriptures are silent as to what their fate shall be.

"Second probation" or "extended probation," a "larger hope," have been advanced as possible theories to explain the difficulties. But they create more than they explain. Others have propounded on the one hand "universal salvation"; while per contra others have urged the "annihilation" of the wicked who refuse to hear the Truth. But better far admit how little we can know of these mysteries of Him of whom St. Paul said, "How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out." (Rom. 11:33). So far as the child is concerned, whether it die in infancy, baptized or unbaptized, before or after Christ's coming its fate is secure in the salvation in Christ Jesus, whose work covers the guilt and condemnation of original sin; so far as the adult believer in Christ Jesus is concerned, the ways of God to man are plain; so far as those who knew Christ Jesus, but consciously rejected Him and His grace presented in the Sacraments and the Word, we are not left in doubt, they must die eternally, banished from God and the glory of His presence; so far as the millions of the race, who died and are dying without a knowledge of the plan of God in Christ, whose lives have been tainted by the stain of Adam's sin and guilt, we cannot, dare not, predicate, with our limited knowledge, our data fail us, we can only afford to await that final assize of the Great White Throne, before which all the world shall appear and where all men shall have a public manifestation and vindication of divine righteousness and of God's purpose in creation and redemption. These shall be set forth in such a clear light as will justify the ways of God to man. A scroll is being written of all these classes of men in all ages of the world by an unerring hand, and when it shall be unrolled in the throne room of God and He shall pronounce judgment on each class "every mouth shall be stopped" from criticism of

God's plans but "Every tongue shall confess that Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." This may be the beginning, as some suggest, of that submission which shall be followed by that state spoken of by St. Paul: "Then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all and in all." (I Cor. 15:28). But we dare not presume to predicate beyond what is written. The clear day of God will reveal everything and everyone will be satisfied in the final work of God as the Creator, the Redeemer and the Judge of all men. Amen.

ARTICLE II.

UNIFICATION OF HIGHER LUTHERAN EDUCATION.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D., (LEIPZIG).

The Lutheran Church is bound by very compact of faith to make its educational equipment effective. And genuine effectiveness is measured neither by the positive nor by the comparative degree when the superlative is possible.

In the manufactory, indeed in all industrial concerns, the managements are to-day being satisfied with nothing short of the maximum of production. And they at the same time demand the minimum of outlay.

The Church in a matter fundamental to its life is by the very necessity of the case compelled to make a similar demand. Its agencies of conservation and self-assertion are merely nominal or altogether futile unless they are adjusted to their power on the one hand and their purpose on the other in such manner as at the same time to conserve the power and to actualize the purpose.

The educational agencies of the Lutheran Church in America are not so adjusted! While this is unfortunate, it is not at all surprising. Our very genesis in this country through hetrogeneous natural elements has forced upon us much structural stuff alien to our inner life and cramping our natural development. That we were born in a university, that Luther was the creator of thinking and Melanchthon the maker of schools we have never quite forgotten. As a church people we have somehow even in America maintained our fathers' old repute for education. Though just why I cannot tell, save it be that one can fool some people all the time and all the people some time. But haven't we stood for education? I hear someone remark, and I hasten to respond that is surely just what we have done—"stood"! We do not in the least overlook the educational efforts that Lutherans have made and are making in our country; they attest a wise faith, an insistent determination, and in many cases real heroism in sacrifice. But they are incommensurate with Lutheran numbers and Lutheran wealth and even Lutheran educational history,

so incommensurate as to occasion remark upon the part of others and on our own part to furnish ground for *reconstruction.*

It is not that we do not have educational ideals or ideas. For these we have and have had. They are part of us. Like the flag they are in our history, and like the rheumatism in our bones. But they have not adequately brought forth. They have been perilously close, in non-productiveness, to a certain New Testament fig tree, which bore leaves.

Nor is it that we lack wealth. I could name, were it not invidious, Lutheran men of substance, German, Scandinavian, American, men with the "pound" purse and not either a penny heart, men who give but whose giving might be multiplied in power, perhaps also in amount, by careful direction. Such men would listen to directions, if the plan of it were dignified by the same amount of care and study and expert investigation as are the other plans into which they put their money in the ordinary and extraordinary procedures of daily business.

Besides this, by the very nature of our people, great aggregates of wealth, in lesser individual quantities are to-day waiting the call of some agent of the Church, who can convince the holders that he calls with authority.

I think you will remember the incident referred to in that little book, "How to Pay Church Debts," which occurred in the neighboring city of York. A certain parishioner never rebuffs his pastor when called upon for funds. He only asks of his pastor how much he ought to give, and being told, gives it forthwith. It was a startling experience; I imagine it would still be equally so to most ministers, and even college presidents. In this case the pastor was so exercised that he was not satisfied at getting the money. He wanted also the reason. He interviewed the giver, saying: "Mr. W., I often ask you for money for religious and charitable purposes. You always give and give liberally. May I ask you how you manage to be able to do this?"

Turning to a corner of the room where was a safe, he said, "In that safe is a special box in which from week to week I put the Lord's money out of my business. Thereafter I count that money no longer mine but His. I am simply the disposer and custodian of it. All that remains for me is to hand it over to the Lord's work when one of His accredited agents asks for it."

Gentlemen representing the educational interests of the Lu-

theran Church in America, I am quite convinced that Lutheran moneys (also brain power) in large enough quantity to meet the real needs of Lutheran education are waiting the accredited agent. But who is the accredited agent who can secure these results? It is the man who either officially or non-officially can convince the holder, along specific lines—of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come.

To do this with any large measure of success there is necessary the having of a plan which will meet business acumen, as well as the moral categories. A winning personal address, a neatly turned witticism, a local interest may get an occasional result for education. But real results will be reached only through such unified plans as will appeal to the instincts of the Christian conservator of wealth. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. We cannot get the son from his home nor the check from his hand by plying him with the things that have been or things that ought to be unless you show him that you yourself have an educational purpose just as wise in its procedure and as effective in its sphere as he demands elsewhere in things of far less moment.

Further, our educational inadequacy is not that we lack men of character and capacity fitting them for educational tasks either professional or executive. In this presence it would be a work of supererogation to call the roll of those superior souls who have in all the various sections of our Church carried on and carried forward our higher educational work with ability and vigor and in some cases with rare skill. There are to-day among our men, Lutheran educators not only in our own colleges but in many state and technical institutions, who rank in talent and equipment with the best of their several classes.

Our deficiency in educational preparedness lies in none of these things. We have in "posse" and we may just as well have in "esse," ideals, men and means. The deficiency is not in our assets, but in their lack of correlation. Our men and our equipment and our ideals must be joined together. Somehow or other, by hook or crook, if you please, these elements of our educational life, these factors of our literary living, these exhibits of our soul strength, these "sine qua non" of the Christian home, must be brought before the marriage altar and the combined officiating Lutheran clergy must pronounce with solemn voice the declara-

tion of union—"what God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

I believe firmly that this will in due time be accomplished, and at present I think we may in hilarious satisfaction, at least publish the bans.

We are driven to the conclusion that in order then to any real efficiency at all proportioned to our objective or to our furnishing, there needs be a unification of our educational interests. Heretofore each institution has been, has it not, merely an individual unit, quite largely a law unto itself. Each like Topsy has just "growed up" irrespective. We may well be proud of some of these individual educational achievements. They are notable for the men they have made and for the men that have made them. But our educational institutions are still individuals only, never alas, seen together, in one group, except on the pages of the almanac, these 26 theological seminaries and 99 colleges and academies and other higher institutions. They are stars but they have not been able to be set in any constellation. They do not feature therefore in the educational zodiac. Their Lutheran educational value is minimized.

Yet our several institutions so isolated in life are of the one Church, and under the same impulsion of faith and history. It is no wonder that the pity and poverty of this isolation is beginning to make its appeal to our educators. Said one of our college presidents four years ago, "The Church may learn a lesson from the politicians. Get together is the cry as they face an approaching election. Party counsel may be divided and factions may struggle for the mastery, but in the face of a common enemy all stand together or all meet overwhelming defeat."

In a summarizing article on education in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Dr. Richard asked, "What is our primal educational need?" and responds with one word, "concentration." Who today can give a better answer?

Out from Leipzig a few miles, one finds on an eminence overlooking all the city and vicinage, a tower from which the generals of the allied army, the Kings of Austria, Italy and Russia, directed the movements of their combined armies against Napoleon in the great "Völkerschlacht." Our educational field also needs some such central review place, from which notes may be

taken of those matters "in transition" which have a plainly evidental purpose.

All the strong, telling volition effecting series of propositions which have been so forceful in centralizing other organic efforts, crystallizing other methods and synthesizing other fields of Lutheran church work apply equally here. They need to be used and broadened in scope.

Intra-synodical centralization has already added to our educational effectiveness, and extra-synodical centralization in higher education is I believe the line of least resistance towards prayed-for Lutheran oneness. And why should even extra-synodical centralization in Lutheran education be too ambitious a project to program?

In the synodical "lining up" which the Map of 20th Century Lutheranism shows, and of which we all, "nolens, volens" are a part, why may we not, perfectly true to our own several apprehensions of faith discriminate between those fields where unified action is yet impossible, and those other spheres of church life where there is not only possibility of unified action, but where such action is at least in many places a persistent demand and one not lightly to be negatived.

Is not higher education a field, at least in some spheres, and in certain locations, where for education and for Lutheranism, for the Commonwealth and the Church, efforts at centralizing might commend themselves to our educators? It seems so to the writer.

The multiplicity of colleges numercially must primarily give place to their multiplication influentially. There may yet be born in our natural development, and no doubt ought to be, other Lutheran colleges, but in the main the day for "Lutheran College Extension Societies" has passed. We here, too, must have not *multa* but *multum*. Heretofore all our scattered forces have been drained in the struggle for maintaining the individual institutions from which one has a diploma, at which another has had happy years—and a third has interests personal, local or commercial.

But what has all this to do with the first interests of the Church? In the beginning, local pride, or the community Croesus has started an institution. Similar Croesus have produced other institutions at or near the same place and of like kind and

for a similar purpose. In the initial unorganized condition of the Church these local centers control the Church's outlook. There is inability to cope with this surplus of College production.

But by and by the Church awakens. The pressure of other great institutions, the absolute requirements of the educational curricula, the insistent demand of professor, student and community at large hastens the awakening.

The Lutheran Church of 1911 is well enough advanced and sufficiently centralized itself to watch for and be influenced by its greater purpose. Locations "per se" have grown less holy; past associations are in themselves and very properly, losing ground, before present considerations. The beneficiaries of the locality, appreciate them as we may, must be esteemed only as they minister to the educational mass. Between a locality, dear to us as earth may hold, and on the other hand the army of our sons and daughters, whose attitude to Church and State, to faith and home lies latent in our institutions, we must and will choose their future. The place must yield to the man.

These new considerations in education, or rather old considerations newly weighed, are growingly forceful. And we Lutherans to-day seek to do what education in all its history has sought—that is to correlate itself with its purpose of self-enhancement. The universities of the Middle Ages were but the culmination of systems. The free cities of Bologne, Milan, Florence in Italy, Lubeck, Hamburg, Leipzig and Nurnburg in Germany established chartered schools, and began at the same time to unify them. The Benedictine schools at St. Galle, Paris, Bec, Rheims and Oxford struggled at once towards existence and towards relationships. The universities of Bologne and Paris and Oxford, separated as they were by lands and laws, were nevertheless integrated in numerous and forceful ways. They all had a common founding through the Church, a common clientele and a common incorporation.

One only needs to take up a modern history of education to note how more and more as civilization has grown democratic, and greater and yet greater stress has necessarily been put upon education, it has been seen that it must be developed in accordance with the laws of unity and order. And those things which are taking place in all the extra-ecclesiastical educational forces

must certainly be taken account of also in the field of education within the Church.

Fewer question the value of the smaller colleges to-day than challenged its right to existence ten years ago. But to maintain its identity and validity, as a force, in this time of choking rivalry, of aggression of corporate funds, of an educational equipment and ideals, harrassing as they are colossal, requires—that college of ours to get in living touch with that college of yours—sympathetically, systematically and speedily.

If then to this need of unification our sense of educational and civil and Church duties compels our assent, how shall it be done? Methods are always delicate. But at once a series of suggestions present themselves.

We may begin the catalogue of unifying possibilities with the more drastic remedies. First, then it is possible to unify by elimination. I am asked, would you snuff out the life of an institution which has done yeoman service? And I answer, I revere service and stand with uncovered head on ground made sacred by educational fathers, but just because I revere service more than sentiment I urge unification—if need be even at the cost of elimination. It has been done by Methodists and Presbyterians scores of times on the unchallenged ground that the Church is greater than the institution and the rights of Church are dominant.

Next there is unification by absorption or combination, an adjustment making one stronger institution take the place of two lesser ones. This is no novelty in educational lines. We have the University of Halle in which in 1815 the University of Wittenberg was absorbed. There is the case of Franklin and Marshall when in 1853 there was unification. Shortly after this the Presbyterian union of Washington and Jefferson. The Methodist Church on the Pacific Coast furnished a number of such instances with which I am familiar.

Closely akin to combination or absorption may be named the adjustment of educational institutions by re-location. In this way a college congested district may be made to furnish some of its surplus of wisdom to another district which is less favored and really college needy. Thus where there has been through natural or even artificial means a sort of gerrymandered plethora of colleges there ought for the sake of the cause both of the Church

and State, be an educational "re-apportionment." This may not be easy. The localization of endowment, or some limitations of charter may make difficult or even impracticable such change otherwise so desirable.

Indeed I am well aware that the processes of educational unification by elimination, absorption, combination and re-location are by reason of many difficulties, both of law and tradition, operative only as a last resort. Yet heroic surgery has often saved the patient and when any institution shall have become an educational appendix—and invalided at that—a prompt excision is called for.

Less severe, and a remedy that ought to be able to be applied, is unification by differentiation. Our Lutheran institutions of higher education, located just as they are, and graded according to real needs and their ability to do work, would fill our field and do it well. If of the total of 123 institutions we should have fewer theological seminaries (absorption or combination) and a re-adjustment of universities, colleges and academies, how much better our work could be done. There should be academies where there are now colleges, colleges where there are now universities. There might be here the transposition of a college into a young ladies' seminary or a boys' school, there a specially equipped technical course locally demanded. By this sort of judicious unification of our system, there should be no need of transplanting a single institution, nor of any absorption—only such a differentiation as would properly systematize our educational needs. An old institution would thus at its old location become a new institution through the new alignment of its work, with a new purpose fitted to a new unified system.

But outside of these processes of unification, by a literal transplanting of the physical equipment, there is another sphere in which results may be attained—and the operation of which is eminently practical—that is the standardization of our institutions through interchange. We acknowledge our community of interests. Yet we cannot, we say, at present take heroic measures. Then at least may we not adopt some of a second series of possibilities.

We can look toward unification through conferences such as this. Our institutions have already realized on last year's conference. Others will follow, and become producers of assets to-

wards Lutheran educational systematization. Why should not this General Conference eventuate in a Lutheran College Presidents' Conference, a Lutheran Theological Faculty Conference, on practical school problems, a Lutheran Trustees' Conference including the officers of governing boards of all Lutheran institutions in America, a Lutheran Editorial Conference for our editors too are educators. One sees how prolific this simple conference idea may be for Lutheran educational unification.

Second, I would suggest a standardization by extra-synodal Boards of Education. Doubtless most of our synodal bodies have now their educational interests in seggregate hands. If not, this is the first step. Why then should that which synodally has been so efficient, not be able to be of tremendous moment trans-synoally. Beginning in the East let the great State which took the lead in founding Lutheran institutions, also lead in the idea of unification. Pennsylvania shall then become for us also Transylvania.

The idea of an inter-educational committee is easily possible and highly practical. It might come under the unified supervision of our Lutheran work in the larger universities and matters of equally grave character.

But further, this unification may be advanced and at the same time our institutions greatly enhance their standing as vital educational factors by a standardization through inter-collegiate harmonization of curricula. It is neither my purpose nor field to discuss the value of a higher academic standard—that is settled. The growth of knowledge itself compels it. Further, the pressure of the modern foundations and indeed the very laws of the several States necessitate it. But now that the change in curricula is taking place, may we not in the remaking of the curriculum consider our own college relations. Pay attention in the new curricula to the "Foundations," if you please, to the State exactions, if you must, but surely also to our own people and their combined college work. As our curricula are rebuilding, we are in duty bound to keep our own college relations in word and heart.

Two further methods present themselves, for us, somewhat unique perhaps, but none the less pertinent.

The first is the plan of Cecil Rhodes, and the second that of Emperor William. In each case we apply a now accepted and

growing educational principle, to our Lutheran family and its educational problems. In each case we should thereby increase the scope of our educators' influence and the consequent advantages to our Lutheran growth, and in addition thereto the unity of Lutheranism would gain momentum, through a new and broader use of materials now at hand and only awaiting administration. Cecil Rhodes' scholars from all parts of America domicile to-day in Oxford. The Rhodes idea was thereby to unify English-speaking peoples by giving them similar educational ideals. In Germany the same thing exists. No university student is permitted to complete his course at the same university. Bavarian must spend a semester at least in Berlin or the Giessen or Marburg; the West Prussian is liable to study at Konigsberg or Breslau in the extreme East; the Heidelberger comes to Leipzig, the Saxon passes over to Halle, the Schleswig-Holsteiner goes to Erlangen, the Tubingener to Bonn. Who may measure the nationally unifying influence of this student migration to the German State? Is such an idea as this with its pregnant possibility not capable of our use? Could not two institutions with similar curriculum exchange a student for a semester or two, under definite conditions? It would surely enlarge the scope of the student and unify the ideals of education. This method has stood the test as a State unifier. Why may it not serve as a Church unifier as well.

However, more easy than this and altogether practical, let us standardize and unify by the Emperor William's idea of interchange of professors. Berlin and Harvard exchange a professor each year. The result has been admirable. The idea is expanding in educational circles. Very recently Harvard has enlarged this plan by an interchange with four western colleges, among them Beloit, Grinnell and Knox. Thus students may be exchanged—the German and English institutions prove it; professors may be exchanged—the present educational transfers illustrate it. And what is now doing by courts and wise men for the State, shall not the Master's wise men be able to use for the Church and the kingdom?

There is in addition a consummation I may mention in passing. It is the idea of an educational capstone in the oft mooted Lutheran university. The conception is not as visionary as it has seemed to many. Nothing is visionary which is necessary,

and the proper integration of Lutheran higher education at least externally will let something to be desired until there is unification in the very highest features of intellectual effort. This, however, is a matter which is extrinsic and which of necessity will find its own place as Lutheran education gradually systematizes.

The solutions of unification above attempted, in barest outline, have their possibilities alone in the recognition of a few clean-cut and axiomatic propositions. These are, the principles of economy, of efficiency and of correlation, the last of which may find its educational expression thus:

The Lutheran institution is not *selbstzweck*—not an end in itself. It is a minister of purpose. It must therefore always be able to say to the Church in due deference to the latter's life and progress, you must increase even though I must decrease. With the inner understanding of this principle, the unification of Lutheran higher education ought not to be outside the range of present possibility.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE III.

THE BIBLE.[1]

BY REV. G. U. WENNER, D.D.

The English speaking world celebrates this year the anniversary of a book. Three hundred years ago there was completed the so-called Authorized Version of the English Bible. Other versions in the English tongue had for more than a century preceded it, but this one, made by the most eminent scholars of the reign of James the First, the flowering time of the English language, was destined to hold for three centuries an unquestioned grip upon the affections of its readers. Recent times have been fruitful in other versions, such as the Revised Version, the Modern Reader's Bible and the Twentieth Century Bible, but by reason of its stately style, its simplicity and its purity, the English Bible of 1611 will not soon be superseded. No Englishman or American knows his own language as he ought to know it until he has learned the words and idioms of the King James Version.

In conformity with a custom which has existed for many years, the directors of the American Tract Society esteem it a privilege to present to each of the members of the graduating class of the United States Military Academy a copy of the English Bible. We recognize in you, as officers of the Army of the United States, the men who will be called upon to represent in a large degree the honor and the security of the nation, and we desire to place in your hands this book not only as a token of our personal regard, but also because we believe it to be a weapon of incomparable value in the responsible position to which you will be called. The Apostle Paul uses a military figure when he speaks of it as the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God. Complying likewise with an ancient custom, I have chosen as the basis of my address a text of the Holy Bible which may at least serve as a motto, to indicate in a general way the thoughts I desire to present. This text is taken from the sacerdotal

1 An address delivered to the graduating class of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.

prayer of our Lord in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of St. John: "I Have Given Them Thy Word." Three questions are suggested by the occasion.

1. What is the Bible? The word Bible means book. Since the thirteenth century Biblia is a noun in the singular number. Prior to that time it was a neuter plural. And such, in truth, the Bible is; it is a collection of 66 books, 39 of the Old Testament and 27 of the New Testament. The books are of varied authorship, kings and peasants are numbered among the writers. Its composition extended over 1600 years. Nevertheless by the common consent of Christendom it is regarded as one book.

Not only the authorship of the books but their content also is very varied. The Old Testament was divided into law, prophets and the psalms. In it we find some of the oldest historical writings of the world. Moses wrote a thousand years before Herodotus, the Father of History. The poetry of the Bible enraptured men before Homer sang his Iliad or Pindar his Odes. Hebrew jurisprudence antedates Lycurgus by seven hundred years and the code of Justinian by twenty centuries. It presents to us the lives of heroes from the early dawn of human history, and its books of wisdom will outlive untold generations of men.

The New Testament also has a varied character. It is said that Thomas Beecher once took for his text its title page: "The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," and turning over the leaves, he repeated: four biographies, a book of travels, a bundle of letters and a dream.

The Christian Church has never been without her Bible, her Sacred Scriptures. In the early period of her history, she still lived in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Christ himeslf pointed to them, saying "they are they which testify of Me."

Christ did not leave a written message. He was Himself the living word. The only words that He ever wrote were written on the sand, and were wafted away by the winds. But He, the living word, was impressed in imperishable characters on the hearts and souls of men, and through His followers as well as through His spoken and remembered words, the record of His life will continue to be read to the end of time.

The early Christians were gathered into the Church by means of the spoken word. In course of time, it became necessary for the perpetuation of the message to reduce to writing the mes-

sages of Christ and the Apostles. The result of this work is found in the books of the New Testament.

This is not the time or the place to speak of the criticism of these books in respect to their authorship or date of composition. It is sufficient to say that in spite of all the efforts of its critics, the genuineness and authenticity of these books has not been successfully controverted. They remain to this day the records and writings of the men and the times that claim them. While the Old and New Testaments have each a distinct character and mission, the Church has always looked upon them as one book, with a single message and a single purpose, the redemption of men from the power of sin and their restoration to the new and divine life. The ancients expressed the relation of the two Testaments to each other in this way: The New is concealed in the Old. The Old is revealed in the New.

Other religions also have their Sacred Scriptures. A favorite task for scholars in recent years is the study of comparative religions. It needs but a slight examination to discover the wide difference between the Bible and the Scriptures of other religions. In briefest statement the difference is this: Other religions impose laws of righteousness which men do not and cannot obey. The religion of the Bible brings men into a new relation, infuses a new life and thus brings them into conformity with the will of God.

As to what these Scriptures are, the conviction of the Christian Church has been always, everywhere and in all its divisions, that they are the Word of God. In respect to the method and manner in which God made known His will to men there have been many differences of opinion. In the field of criticism there is to-day going on a great conflict in which philosophical acumen and historical research are fighting battles in the air such as have never been provided for in the tactics of the world's armies. But that the Bible is in a real sense the Word of God, is the common confession of Christendom and has been from the beginning. The Nicene Creed is a document to which Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics and Protestants alike subscribe, and among its tenets is the one that the Holy Ghost "spake by the prophets."

There are external indications of its divine origin. In view of the incomparable vigor and beauty of its diction, Oetinger called it the language of the court of heaven. In view of its adapta-

tion to the spiritual wants of the humblest as well as the mightiest intellects, Gregory the Great said that it was a river in which a lamb might walk and an elephant must swim. It has an imperishable vitality, demonstrated in the lives of millions of men and in the history of nations and periods. In the philosophy of history the need of its teaching in the redemption and preservation of the world has been clearly shown.

But while these things have a conformity effect for the Christian believer, they are not the foundation on which he rests his belief in the divine origin and character of the Bible. Rather is it Christ Himself. He is the final authority in religion. He has given us God's Word. And our faith in that Word is confirmed by the Holy Spirit of whom it is said: "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."

The experience of filial relation to God is not that of only a few exalted or peculiar individuals. It is a universal privilege, and its reality has been demonstrated in all the ages in the lives of those who call themselves Christians. To them this conviction of the divine origin of the Book makes it the voice of supreme authority. Not indeed a codex of laws, or of external statutes, but the voice of a father to which the child with joyful heart responds. The Bible is the Word of God.

The second question:

2. What is the Bible to the world? The civilization of the Western World has two principal roots. One of these springs from ancient Greece, the other from that little country on the eastern shore of the Mediteranean which we know as the Holy Land. From the first we derive our secular culture, from the other our religious life.

The civilization of ancient Greece, with its incomparable glory of literature and art has passed away. It represented the consummate flower of human effort and genius. But it was of the earth, earthy, and had no power to meet the deepest needs of human life.

The civilization of the Holy Land was essentially religious in its scope and purpose. It gradually assimilated all that was worth preserving in the life of Greece and Rome.

For 1500 years this Christian civilization of which the Bible is the fundamental constitution, has been the dominant force in

the western world. And there are at this time not lacking signs that in its conquering progress around the world, the religion of the Bible will give to the oriental world the impulse which it needs to awaken it from its age-long slumber. It would be impossible to eliminate the Bible from modern civilization without taking away everything that gives it cohesiveness and vitality.

As literature the Bible means much to the world. The classic productions of Greece and Rome had failed to regenerate the nations. But the inspired song of the Anglo-Saxon Caedmon of the seventh century, the Father of English Song, and of the Saxon author of the Heliand of the ninth century, giving to the people "in notes almost divine" the story of the Bible, laid the foundations for an imperishable literature permeated with the images and spirit of the Bible. Thus Shakespeare and Milton, Tennyson and Browning, Longfellow and Whittier, simply repeat to us in their own tongues the wonderful things which they learned from the Scriptures.

A writer in the chief literary journal of France some years ago concluded an article as follows:

"In a conference of thoughtful men the question was put what book a man would be likely to choose who, condemned to life-long imprisonment, would be permitted to take with him into his cell only a single book. There were Catholics, Protestants and men of no religion at the conference, but the unanimous decision was that there was but one book upon which the choice could fall, the Bible.

Art is an essential element of civilization. The Bible is a friend of art. Before printing had made it possible for tract societies and Bible societies to circulate the printed Word, the nations of Europe learned the Bible story from the wayside or churchyard crosses, with their carved pictures of sacred scenes, or from the "storied windows richly dight, casting their dim religious light." The facades of the cathedrals, as well as the carvings in wood and stone on the inside, told the story of the Bible to the generations of men that passed by. Wandering minstrels sang to delighted people the same story and thus helped to keep alive the fundamental conceptions of our Christian faith.

The productions of Michael Angelo, of Raphael and of Rembrandt are only first reproductions of the imperishable originals

of the Holy Scriptures. "The single conception of the Virgin and the Child has done more for the elevation of art than all the exhumed models of Greece and Rome." The impression which the Bible has thus made upon literature and art can never be effaced. Take away from painting or sculpture or music or poetry the Biblical ideas and conceptions that gave them inspiration, and what would there be left worth preserving?

I might speak of what the Bible is to the home, and of all that it has done for general education. I might speak of its influence on the one hand in cultivating sound individualism, in developing character, and on the other hand of its work in promoting true socialism by its spirit of unselfishness and altruism. But I need only to remind you of these things. The limits of my time forbid my enlarging upon them. Let us rather consider a question in which we as Americans must take an abiding interest, I refer to the maintenance of the Republic and the preservation of civil liberty.

The Bible is the mother of civil liberty. Three nations are doubtless to-day leaders in the progress of the world, England, Germany and the United States. The government of these peoples differ somewhat in details and outward form, but they are all essentially republics, people to whom have been secured by the constitution of their government a large degree of civil liberty. In each of these nations the universal acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures and loyalty to its ideals have been not only a source of national strength and progress but have made possible the attainment of that greatest book in government, civil liberty.

In the United States we have no established religion. Our institutions were formed by men who desired to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. The name of God does not appear in the Constitution, but the American people were permeated with the principles of the Bible and the founders of the republic manifested at every step their dependence upon its guidance and direction. It was their faith in the Word of God that led the American Congress in the height of the Revolution to pass an Act by which side by side with an appropriation for the purchase of gunpowder there stood an order for the importation of 20,000 copies of the Scriptures.

Republicanism was foreshadowed in the Hebrew Common-

wealth 3,000 years before the settlement of Jamestown. Thomas Jefferson was indebted for his conception of the American government to the polity of an obscure church in Virginia. In 1687 a humble pastor in Massachusetts published a pamphlet entitled "Democracy in Christ's Government." A hundred years later it was republished as a political document for the times. In connection with the repeal of the Stamp Act Pastor Mayhew wrote to James Otis:

"I have learned from the Holy Scriptures that wise and brave and virtuous men are always friends to liberty—and that where the spirit of the Lord is there is liberty. This made me conclude that freedom is a great thing."

To what are we to ascribe the importance of the Bible in its relation to political principles? A nation is strong not in proportion to its material resources or the invincibility of its army, but rather in proportion to the greatness of its ideas. Material things are not the real forces of civilization. The Bible emphasizes the regeneration of the individual. It recognizes the dignity of human nature. It exalts the spiritual over the material. The Bible makes men. It inspires ideals. It lays the foundation for character. For such reasons the Bible is the indispensable book in a land where civil liberty is regarded as a priceless possession. These are some of the answers in response to the question as to what the Bible means to the world. Nevertheless it does not follow that the Bible is held in as high estimation as it should be.

A cynical remark was recently made by one of the papers to the effect that while it might be the best seller, it was not the best read. We shall not discuss the point, but will assume that there is some basis for the statement. Indeed it is quite conceivable in our jealous care to protect the principle of religious liberty and to avoid the dangers of denominational strife, that in our system of public education we have neglected to make adequate provision for even a moderate acquaintance with the most important book of the world. College professors complain that allusions to the "cloud no larger than a man's hand," the "armor of Saul" or "the hand-writing on the wall" meet with but a feeble recognition because of the students' uncertain acquaintance with the original story.

A news item was published a few weeks ago about the circula-

tion of a large number of copies of the Bible on the Pacific coast by the members of Gideon's Band. At once there was a lively inquiry as to who Gideon was and what kind of a band he had.

It is said that a thorough acquaintance with the Bible was one of the strong points in the education and intellectual culture of Abraham Lincoln. But more important than a mere acquaintance with the story of the Bible is the question of its bearing upon conduct and the development of morality. We cannot be indifferent to the dangers which threaten the land when such terms as financial honor, political righteousness and personal purity are not regarded with jealous care. We have practically excluded the Bible from the Public School, but to every man who claims to be a lover of his land, the relation of Bible teaching to national prosperity is a question of primary importance. The problem is surrounded with many difficulties, but to the question of its solution no patriot should refuse to give his aid.

In presenting this, I have briefly touched upon what the Bible is and what it means to the world. Both questions are worthy of large treatment and lifelong study. In attempting to answer them I have touched only the periphery of the subject. In the final analysis the real question for every one of us is, "What does the Bible mean to me?" And this is the third question I shall attempt to answer.

I have spoken of the Bible as the Word of God. But this is a statement which no man can take upon the mere assertion of any other man. All that we can do is to approach the question with an open mind. And like St. Augustine we may pray, "Thou, O Lord hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are not at rest until they find their rest in Thee."

According to the teachings of Christ the Word which He gave to His disciples was in itself a seed of the kingdom. It was not a dead letter but it was a channel for the communication of a divine life. All that was necessary was that His disciples should keep the Word, abide in it in order to experience its effect. That effect would be that they would recognize Him as the one sent for their salvation and would believe in Him. Such faith would bring to pass in them the new life through which they would be His children indeed, the fellowship of those who are being saved.

It may be interesting in this presence to recall that the very

first convert of the Gentile world was a captain of the Roman army and that his conversion was the direct result of his readiness to receive this Word of God.

On the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, commanding the rocky coast of Syria there was located at the beginning of the Christian era the city of Caesarea. Here a Roman cohert was stationed. Among its officers was a man by the name of Cornelius, doubtless a member of the distinguished patrician family of that name in Rome. A remarkable experience in his life led him to send for the Apostle Peter who was living at the time in a neighboring city. When Peter arrived, Cornelius said to him, "Now we are all here present before God to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." The result of that meeting was the conversion of Cornelius. He was baptized, and as one of the first converts from the Gentile world, became the leader of an innumerable host from the non-Jewish world who subsequently received the Gospel message.

Reduced to its ultimate terms Christianity consists of three things, a living Christ, a living Word, a living Church. Upon this foundation we rest our faith.

New York, N. Y.

ARTICLE IV.

METHOD IN CATECHIZATION.[1]

BY REV. W. H. FELDMANN.

Comenius truly says, "All men require education and God has made children unfit for other employment that they may have leisure to learn." Rosseau says, "We are born weak, we have need of strength; we are born destitute of everything, we have need of assistance; we are born stupid, we have need of understanding; all is bestowed by education." Plato in his ideal state made the teacher an important factor. Jesus was often called teacher. His last command was to teach. The power of the Church is measured by the ability of her teachers. Christianity is the propagation of a trust and truth. The Sunday School and the catechetical class are the recruiting agencies of the army of the Church. Both need teachers. There is a loud cry of disappointment at present concerning the results of catechization; and men are beginning to doubt the wisdom of the course. The trouble is not with the catechism, nor with the child; but with the method—or lack of method more likely! Proper teaching requires method and the method of teaching has become a science. Our effort shall be directed to show some method in catechization.

We say method rather than methods; since diversity of gifts and inclinations, both in teacher and scholar, will be expressed through various methods. Furthermore, differing conditions, environment and education must be met with, and the work arranged accordingly. For instance, in Europe there is daily instruction in religion and the catechism by trained teachers; some places have a city catechist; whereas here everything must be done by the Church after the regular school hours; when the child is exhausted and ready for play. Some have week-day instruction while others have two lessons a week; some have a corps of helpers and some leave it all to the pastor. Thus no definite plan can be offered that will meet all conditions. However there are

1 Read at the Southern Conference of the Synod of New York and published by its request.

certain fundamental truths that are of universal application and these we hope to touch on in a general way.

Before proceeding there are two heresies that we wish to condemn "in toto," namely, "hearing the lesson" if thereby is meant the parrot fashion of recitation so often practiced; the other is to confirm on a certain day simply because it is customary! Children should be confirmed when ready and not before.

We also object to the instruction as the average seminary conducts it. Catechetics is not to be learnt by reading or lectures. Medical students sit in the operating theatre and watch the professor perform the operation. Who would think of letting a man operate because he had read everything on hygiene or anesthetics? Catechetics is a practical subject and should be taught by demonstration. The professor should gather a class from the churches in the place and teach the students by teaching the scholars. That would be practical theology! None of us enjoy such tuition probably!

Since the mill wont drive with the water that is past, let us see if we cannot make some amends for these defects by studying what the world's acknowledged masters in education have said and done. We propose to treat the subject from the pedagogical standpoint.

A brief sketch of the struggles and triumphs of the science of pedagogics may not be amiss!

It is the story of the old against the new. It is the struggle of obstinate classicism on one side and radical outbursts of opposition on the other. The former flowered in the "Ratio Studiorum" of the Jesuits which was recognized by the bull of Paul III, 1540. The Jesuits were commissioned "especially for the purpose of instructing boys and ignorant persons in the Christian religion." Under this method grammar was the norm for all instruction and made the chief part of all education. It was a purely mechanical method and laid the chief stress on the training of the memory. It made them masters of one book. This method, with slight modifications, is to-day pursued by the Jesuits in the training of their men. Bacon and Descartes were loud in their praises of their work. The Renaissance brought reformers to the fore in education as well as in religion. Luther's catechism was the Augustana of modern education in some respects. The change began by criticising the method of studying Latin in

which Roger Ascham led the way. Then the cry was put forth to study things as well as words: prominent in this was Montaigne, who attacked the method of Sturm in Germany, Ascham in England, and the Jesuits everywhere. Though Montaigne had advanced principles, he left them to others to work out. He loved the Spartan deed to the Athenian phrase-builder; as Cicero said, "They have followed the greatest of all arts, the art of living rightly in life rather than in literature." Locke and Rosseau followed in his wake.

Then came Ratich—the chief of innovators. His school at Köthen was, in a sense, a dismal failure, yet he has left indelible marks of real progress. Milton too had uttered some great truths but like his poetry they were epical, "He was the most notable man that ever kept school." Then Comenius with his Janua Linguarum, Orbus Pictus and Didactica Magna surprised the world. Though he agreed with the Jesuits in object he differed in the method of attainment. He brought Bacon's philosophy to bear in matters of education. His general conception of education was, first, to know all things; second, to master all things, including self; third, to refer all to God." His cry was back to nature! He says "nature has implanted the seeds, (1) of learning, (2) of virtue, (3) of piety." After a stormy and eventful life this bishop of the Moravians died amid apparent disappointment; but his memory should be cherished as the fore-runner of the great Pestalozzi.

Then Locke, with his notion of the "gentleman" of his day, entered a protest against the public schools and their effect; offered maxims on health, pointed out the place of reason in education, showed the value of a trade and objected very loudly to the harshness then in vogue which, from all accounts, must have been terrifying. He based it all on his philosophy and the experience gained as a private tutor.

Another important factor in the development of pedagogics was Rosseau the radical. He saw through the rottenness of the existing condition of society and its baneful effects on the youth of the land. His protests against the same led him to extremes. His doctrine of negativism is reprehensible; for "Liberty a la Rosseau" is really child anarchy. His dictum "Man as he might be is perfectly good," and "Man as he is, is utterly bad" is only specious though attractive. Nevertheless his Emile is an epochal

book. Of him Browning said, "Rosseau stands astride across the whole field of education; nothing comes after him not affected by him." The chief value of his work, and who can overestimate it, is his wonderful insight into child nature. He also left his impress on Basedow and Pestalozzi.

Then Basedow, the inexplicable—whom Goethe seemed to cherish—raised a protest against the existing things as they were in Germany. Though his Philanthropin in Dessau, left much to be desired, and though he tried to incorporate too much in his system, nevertheless his method, in part at least, is followed in Germany to-day. His Robinson Crusoe, the Younger, is a favorite after all these years! Kant in his treaty on pedagogy says "One fancies, indeed, that experiments in education would not be necessary; and that we might by the understanding be able to tell whether any plan might turn out well or ill. But this is a great mistake. Experience shows that often in our experiments we get quite opposite results from what we had anticipated—it is not in the power of one generation to form a complete plan of education. The only experimental school which, to some extent, made a beginning in clearing the road, was the institute at Dessau. It was the only school in which teachers had the liberty to work according to their own methods and schemes."

Let us see what we owe to Pestalozzi, the chief of them all. His Leonhard and Gertrude, Evening Hours of a Hermit, and How Gertrude Teaches Her Children, will be formative probably for generations to come. He was the son of a clergyman and perhaps his early training gave him that burning love for mankind that marks his whole life and was the secret of his success. He invented the object lesson. He made a clear distinction between childhood and youth. He laid stress on the care to be exercised in infancy. He demanded a "thinking love" in the work and calling of a teacher. He coupled reflection with observation. His modeling gave Froebel the hint of the "Kindergarten." Raumer says, "He compelled the scholastic world to revise the whole of their task, to reflect on the nature and destiny of man and also on the proper way of leading him from his youth toward that destiny."

Of Jacotot, we quote Payne in passing; he says, "For Jacotot I think the claim, may without presumption be maintained, that he has beyond all other teachers, succeeded in co-ordinating the

method of elementary teaching with the method of investigation."

Herbert Spencer as the apostle of synthetic philosophy has been more of a critic than a teacher or an originator. He and Herbart have touched more on the psychological side of the subject. Froebel, of whom Michelet says, "Froebel has solved the problem of education," is noted for the fact that he has made education a pleasant thing by securing spontaneous activity. The stress he lays on intuition is worthy of the most profound consideration! Dr. G. Stanley Hall says, "If Froebel was mystic and enthusiastic like Delsarte and Jahn, like them he based his system upon careful observation of human nature and the deepest sympathy with those he worked for."

Thus we see how the much despised teacher has a wonderful history back of him; and it would be well for us to profit by the labors of others for the good of our children; for the teacher's blunders have done more mischief than the proverbial birch. His is a place of power; pregnant with great possibilities for good or bad even as it is wisely or foolishly used. In Nat. Deor. it says "The authority of those who teach stands much in the way of those who learn." The Jesuits taught the teacher and then sent him forth to teach—not to talk or preach!

We would therefore ask ourselves what are the essentials for making a capable teacher? We conceive them to be the following: his preparation, his personality, his management of the class both as to order and to work.

Cicero in his De Officiis says, "In all matters, before beginning, a diligent preparation should be made." An extempore sermon is bad enough, but extemporaneous catechization is worse! The teacher expects preparation of his pupil, why not of himself? Because he has taught it one year it does not follow that it can't be improved on! But how shall he prepare? Men fly to books first. These tell us what others have done. Where shall we find such? Let me quote Prof. Seely, "The best books are in German." Most of these deal with an analysis of the material or suggest illustrations. Few, if any, deal with the pedagogics of catechization. Of course it is a prerequisite that he be master of the subject. He must enter the class without the book! Cripples need crutches—well men walk without. Before he faces his pupils, he ought to have answered among others the following

questions. How shall I present this truth, will the child catch the force of this statement, is this palpably true or can an objection be raised, how will the child-mind look at this truth, what is the most orderly way of presentation, how does it bear on what has gone before, can the child refer to its own life or experience for corroboration? These and many others we repeat, must be answered before he ever enters the classroom! We cannot agree with Jacotot, "Everyone can teach, moreover he can teach what he does not know." He can never give what he has not got! He can never inspire by dead ashes of past performance. He must keep perennially new if he wishes to hold and help! This is possible only when there has been careful preparation.

But the teacher influences as much by what he is as by what he says. Think of Arnold of Rugby, or Christlieb of Bonn; of the power of Tholuck, Hopkins, or Hengstenberg over their pupils! Locke emphasized this fact as a character-builder. Therefore, personal habits are a matter of gravest concern. Likes, dislikes, temperament, habits are helps or hindrances, even as they are winning or otherwise. This calls for an unsparing introspection and all might say with Burns,

> "O, wad some power the giftie gie us
> To see ourselves as ithers see us."

The Jesuits sought to suppress all personal peculiarities and opinions and would make the teacher merely the mouthpiece. They crushed out all personality to secure uniformity, even to the letter. We cannot afford to commit pedagogical suicide! However we should be on the alert. Children are quick to note the foibles and weaknesses of their superiors. Some of us recall a teacher who was always going "to look it up"! Laziness pays for its ease with respect—a terrible price. They also know when a question is parried and are not slow to set traps for the humiliation of the teacher. Pretended wisdom is walking a slack wire—it is a risk; and sooner or later will lead to a fall! We would say that the personal equation is of gravest concern to anyone who would teach!

The teacher stands or falls as he is able to control his class. To do this, he must know childhood and youth. That teacher is a failure who can't or wont imagine himself into child life. Ex-

cept ye become as little children ye cannot enter into the kingdom of childhood! We must understand his active imagination with its aircastles, his likes and dislikes, the richness of his feelings and affections. There is the phlegmatic, the emotional, the deliberative, the impulsive, the pugnacious boy. There is the bright one and the plodder, the supersensitive and the indifferent child; the cheerful, the gloomy, the forgiving, the resentful one; we must be all things to all men, but also to all children! All these have their peculiarities and no two can be handled just alike. The teacher will have to gain an avenue of approach and it is wise to do so by the line of least resistance when dealing with their faults, and with genuine reciprocity when dealing with their virtues. This establishes confidence and lightens the burdens of the classroom.

The class room is the teacher's kingdom, here he should feel at home and be the ruling spirit. The classroom can become the birthplace of lasting impressions of incalculable worth—or a veritable Gehenna of disgust!

The work of the classroom in a general way, divides itself as follows: (a) to present the subject; (b) to secure attention.

Aristotle says, "The desire of knowledge is implanted in man, and the mind grows as the body does—by taking proper nourishment, not by being stretched on the rack." Yet how often instruction becomes an inquisition and the teacher an arch-tormentor! He does this when his presentation is mechanically rendered. Humdrum teachers make humdrum scholars and a humdrum subject. Be it remembered that the teacher is to inculcate a love for the study; and to do this it is necessary as Pestalozzi has shown to develop a "habit of constant analysis." We must remind ourselves that instruct—instruere—means to put in order, build, construct. Therefore, we must find out what the pupil knows and understands, and build up from this point. Too often the floodgates are thrown open and the whole thing is poured out at once! Draught destroys and a deluge drowns—they both kill. Let the approach be gradual. Knowledge is a stair to be climbed, not a balloon ascension. If a question be asked, let it be answered briefly, clearly! Don't recite a volume or quote forty authors about it! Have some pity for the child's mind. Above all don't preach. If you want to lose attention—preach!

A man may be a Solomon, but he is doomed as a teacher if at-

tention and order are wanting! Many are the ways to secure it —the worst way is to scold! Here the teacher must lead the way by his example. "Interest begets interest," says Pestalozzi. Enthusiasm is contagious. If the teacher is abounding in earnestness the scholar cannot escape it. Attention practically means bringing the child's mind into subjection to yours. Here also the line of least resistance and least effort is to be consulted. Getting attention is like overcoming inertia: it is best done says Rousseau "by the discovery of new truth and hatred of old abuses." Furthermore, cheerfulness is a great help to secure it! Some men are as magnetic as a mudbank!

Much could be said about class discipline; but we will barely touch on the same. Order is imperative. Confusion means waste of time and energy. Yet like the finest rhetoric it is most effective when least noticed. Rosseau's advice is well worth remembering, "Let him be his own master in appearance and do thou take care to be so in reality." The rod or its equivalent, like war, is the last resort and the poorest. Ratich was decidedly opposed to coercion. Locke was most emphatic against all harshness in instruction. This is commonly accepted as right to-day. Yet firmness must prevail! "Caprice on the part of teacher or scholar is never to be tolerated!" Rosseau wisely says, "When the child desires what is necessary, you ought to know and immediately comply with its requests; but to be induced to do anything by its tears, is to encourage it to cry: it is to teach it to doubt your good will, to think you are influenced more by importunity than benevolence." Excessive indulgence is the highway to disorder. With it goes the sin of favoritism. The Jesuit Constitution warned their preceptors as follows: "Don't let any favoring of the nobility interfere with the care of meaner pupils, since the birth of all is equal in Adam, and their inheritance in Christ Jesus." They also were told to make all punishment as light as possible. We would suggest that the child be judged by his mates, and, if possible, have them carry it out in their own decisions! Life, is, in part, the story of judgment and choice. More could be said on this subject: suffice to say, order is needed to get attention and attention is needed to teach. There is the other side of the question to consider, and this we wish to take up now—the child.

We must not only know the subject but we must know the

child. A knowledge of childlife is an absolute prerequisite. The great Swiss said, "The most critical interval of human nature is that between the hours of birth and twelve years of age. Paul said when I was a child I spake as a child." They are neither angels nor animals, but children. Child life is something distinct in and of itself. Pestalozzi says, "Childhood must not be sacrificed to learning." Would that this were practiced. A child is a man minus experience. Yet we all take it for granted that the child has this experience and thus throw its mind into a state of confusion! Rosseau says, "Nature requires children to be children before they are men; we pervert this." What then, are the chief characteristics of child life? We think they are the following: they are impressional, intuitional, incipient and possess a strong faculty for memorizing.

They have stepped from the nursery and home into the great wonderland of the world. Everything is new and strange! Their parents are still giants to them. Their word is law and their influence mighty. Since they are so impressional and hold the parents so high it is the duty of the teacher to secure the aid of the parents by having them "extol teaching and learning" as Comenius suggests. Teach the parent, then the child! Training begins at home! Rosseau is right, "Where there is no mother there can be no child." In this impressionable state they bring with them certain remarkable powers. One is their excess of vitality. "The old concentrate, but youth expands and overflows." The head waters of the Nile of life are crowned with cataracts—beautiful, tumultuous and worthless unless rightly directed! Rosseau says, "The senses are perfected first and these are the first we should cultivate, but they are usually neglected." Comenius laid great stress on this also. The first chapter of Genesis is the story of the senses—sun, moon, stars, fishes, trees. Basedow pointed out the fact that they love noise and motion. They love battles and watch locomotives in motion. Froebel laid stress on their restlessness. They are capable of deep affection. This the Jesuists sought to win. Froebel, therefore, emphasizes sympathy as the door to the child's life; and the Jesuists wisely strove to lead the child and not to drive it and thereby get its displeasure. Pestalozzi makes the order of instruction as follows: (1), affection; (2), intellect; (3), the body.

Being impressionable they are naturally copyists. Theirs is the age of acquisition; fashion, style, customs—everything the eye can see impresses them. For this reason Rosseau cried out bitterly against his age and its rottenness. Children are seriously affected by their surroundings. They are open to every external influence. Since they live in a world of the senses we ought to watch their bodies for they are the barometers of the mind! They mark the states of depression and exaltation and largely affect the results of the classroom. How often a badly ventilated room has brought the wrath of the teacher down on the head of the child for being inattentive! Scold the ventilation or whoever controls it!

Now this world of senses is of great value to the child and is its first teacher in nature; for it brings to its life the revelation of forces without and thus enables it to make comparisons. Education in one sense is, in part, the science of comparisons. It further reveals to the child the fact that it is a distinct and separate being from the world. This is all new to it.

What a child lacks in experience is more than compensated for by that wonderful and mystic power called intuition. There is a force in a child's "because!" Froebel made it the true basis of knowledge. Pestalozzi's object lessons as well as Froebel's gifts were partly intended to enlarge and foster this faculty. We often make too much of reason and experience and entirely overlook the possibilities of intuition, because we fail to see things with the child's eye! It's wonderful opportunities were seized by Froebel—and with what matchless results we know! Particularly is it true in dealing with faith. The child is born in and with faith—it learns to doubt later. The psychology involved is interesting but space and time forbid its consideration here.

Child life is a state of incipiency. What wonderful things are possible yea, that are not even suspected! Some one has truly pointed out that "The tutor must remember that his business is not so much to teach the pupil all that is knowable, as to raise in him a love and esteem of knowledge, and put him in the right way of knowing and improving himself when he has a mind to it." (How many take up the catechism after confirmation?) This was Ascham's idea when he sought to build up a system from within. Pestalozzi followed in his wake. He said we must

consider first what they already possess and not only develop this but bring out the innate faculties. The child has hidden deposits of life that he does not dream of being there! They are unconsciously struggling for expression; as Emerson phrased it: "He acts it as a life before he apprehends it as a truth." We cannot agree with Jacotot's dictum, "All human beings are equally capable of learning," for stars do differ in magnitude; but he is right when he says that it is not the highest function of the teacher to make the pupil the recipient of the teacher's ideas! The Jesuits were right when they sought to discover the pupil's aptitude and inclination. Of course they went to the extreme and bound it in slavery! Nevertheless Jacotot is right when he says that every child has dormant faculties and skillful teaching can bring them out! But it takes time and patience. Rosseau's warning is timely, "Don't then, expect from him (the child) set discourses or studied manners but always the faithful expression of his ideas and the conduct which springs naturally from his inclination." We must bear in mind the meaning of the word education—to draw out. We are not to make the child's mind a teacher's storage warehouse: though this would give the child the idea that it was wise, and please the overindulgent parent and would feed the vanity of the tutor. The teacher's attitude is more that of a trainer than a teacher as Pestalozzi points out. The man who is to do the running is directed by him who sits quietly by and does not exert himself. The child who remarked in the recent "equal pay" controversy in New York schools that she did not see why teachers should be paid at all, since the children had to do all the work, must have had a real teacher and not a hearer of lessons only! It was with this in view that Locke urged the use of reason in teaching. "I am convinced," says Jacotot, "that the method of teaching which approaches most nearly to the method of investigation is incomparably the best, since, not content with serving up a few barren and lifeless truths, it leads to the stock on which they grew; it tends to set the reader (or learner) himself in the track of invention, and to direct him into those paths in which the author has made his own discoveries." This requires exertion and exertion is indispensable for the attainment of knowledge as Pestalozzi shows. Exertion will not hurt the child! We must be on the alert to guard against over-exertion and misdirected effort

however! The question naturally arises how far is the teacher to assist the child in its work?

Rosseau reminds, "If your head always directs the pupil's hands, his own head will become useless to him." Self help strengthens the faculties and causes them to grow: this is absolutely necessary to proper education. Train properly the powers of observation and reflection and compel the pupil to work out the deductions. Needless to say patience is demanded; and Comenius wisely suggests that one be kind and fatherly; and forget not to reward and praise. Too many scold when the child is wrong and forget to commend when he is right. Remember children have an inherent sense of self-respect. They like to be thought somebody and they are! Never be sarcastic! Carlyle says it is the language of the devil—and he ought to know. The "thinking love" and "benevolent superintendence" that Pestalozzi makes so much of, is, alas, too often entirely ignored. To many teachers the child is only a memory machine—a "cash register" of words. Concerning the place and use of memory we will speak under the final grand division, namely, the rationale of catechetics, which we will now consider.

The rationale of catechetics we would divide into two parts: (1), the critical apparatus; (2), methodology.

Channing says, "You may accumulate the most expensive apparatus for instruction; but without an intellectual (we would say intelligent), gifted teacher, it is little better than rubbish." We assent to part of this remark. We admit that there is no sovereign virtue in the thing itself; only as it is used is it valuable. Nevertheless, it is necessary; and the best is highly desirable. There are many catechisms: all possessing some feature of worth and interest. Our own preference is for the Hanoverian catechism—only the teacher must not preach it but teach it!

We would raise certain objections concerning them all. Concerning our own—as to type of binding, we would say that the public school books with their clear type and good paper, as well as their substantial binding show us what is better. As to the contents, we would say that the catechism ought to contain much more or much less—we would prefer the latter; and that a separate "Teacher's Guide" or Vade mecum be issued—something similar to a German "Lehrplan." The children's book ought to contain a dictionary. They read such words as chaste, perjury,

regeneration, etc., but know not what they mean. They read words not thoughts. A regular syllabus ought to be worked out and attached to the teacher's book (if a separate book is issued.) Suitable Bible lessons illustrating the thought, as well as hymns that are appropriate, should be included with the text. The principal words in the questions and answers ought to be underscored pointing out the core of the matter. Too little attention is paid to the question! Yet the answer is wrapt up in the question!

Herbert Spencer emphasized the avoidance of unorganizable fact and Jacotot "unorganizable knowledge"—essentially they are the same. But correlation is possible only where there has been analysis; for our work ought always to be structural and cumulative.

So much for the catechism; but with it go accessories! Christ taught His profound truths by the means of parables because they visualized the truth. Pestalozzi taught all knowledge by sensation and observation. Moral truths stand in need of physical demonstration. The eye is the door of the soul. We can very often save hours of talk by the use of one chemical experiment. Mechanical devices are helpful because of their associational force. The seven branched candle-stick as a help to remember the number of petitions in "The Lord's Prayer" does two things at once.

Good pictures are of great value. We use them in Sunday School, the Sunday newspaper enthralls the youth therewith, the "moving picture show" holds its audience thereby,—why not use it in catechization? Illustrations from nature are helpful: bugs, plants, stones all can be impressed into service.

Literature is a helpmate too! Luther urged the use of Aesop. He thought more of Aesop than he did of Aristotle. We seem to lean more to the latter! Anderson and the "Brothers Grimm" are commendable too!

Biography, both sacred and profane are of worth, since they show us what has been done—not said or theorized about! Children are idealistic. They love heroes and are seeking to copy.

By the above mentioned aids, that variety is secured that Basedow aimed at. But we must avoid becoming profuse. These things should be the spice of the meal, but it is never to be a

meal of spices! There can be no fixed rule as to the use thereof, except that of good sense.

We conclude with the methodology of catechisation. Here we would follow Pestalozzi and Froebel who sought not the "what" but the "how" to teach and think. The division may be classified under the three heads: presentation, examination, re-presentation.

The presentation does not begin with the work in the classroom, but with the conception the teacher has as to method and order and object of study. Many are the arrangements of the same. We will give some of the various views on this subject: for instance, three ways to study a model book are given:

1. It may be read through again and again—Ratich and Hamilton.

2. Each lesson mastered and read in various ways—Ascham.

3. Begin at the beginning and advance a little each time—Jacotot.

Much can be said for and against all these and the predilections of the teacher will probably decide. Perhaps it is possible to combine all three!

As to the order of procedure we will give but two among many. Jacotot's is, (1), learn; (2), repeat; (3), reflect; (4), verify; or, as he puts it elsewhere, (1), get facts; (2), generalize; (3), note the actions to be performed. Comenius' method of education appeals to us as the most suitable, and is as follows: train, 1, senses; 2, memory; 3, intellect; 4,—critical faculty. Whatever method is pursued, we must never forget that body, mind and soul are all to be co-ordinately trained and brought out. We must never forget that intellect, sensibility and will have all alike a claim to proper instruction and development. Another grave question to be solved is how much shall be negative! Negatives are restrictive and distasteful. They express limitations and savor of law. There is no expansion in them!

Certain truths on teaching have been accepted as axiomatic and have been well stated by Marcel in one of his works. We shall quote him under this head from time to time. One is, "that the ultimate object of the study should always be kept in view that the end be not forgotten in the pursuit of the means." Now what is the end to have in view?

To commit so and so many words to memory? Are

we to confirm memory? Those practical Jesuits had a well defined plan! They sought to train the receptive and reproductive powers and therefore laid stress on memory. They produced astute men but not original ones. Though we differ from them in this, yet we would do well to have a clear conception of what we wish to accomplish! Ours is not to be a phrase-culture but to get them to make decisions! They are to confirm! The second question is "Do you believe?" The answer is "yes!" The catechism is to be a living conviction with them! All children do not mature at the same time, nor after the same manner, yet here the Jesuits set us a good example again. They take them as young as possible. We ask usually "how old." Marcel says, "Be it well remembered that first impressions and early habits are the most important, because they are most enduring." Timothy's training is proof of this.

Another axiom is, "The means ought to be consistent with the end." Not all children can be reached by the same method. Basedow's contention for experimentation is right—what helps one may not help another. Therefore, to repeat the same thing in the same way means to waste time and leave the scholar where he was—in the dark! But more of this later.

"The classification of the objects of study should mark for teacher and learner their respective spheres of action." Such a classification will reveal at once that the catechism in all parts cannot be taught alike. The different subjects ought to be developed according to contents and purpose. The commandments are a code stamped with the authority of God. They are to establish His authority and to secure the self-denial and submission of the pupil. It is from without and unalterable. They set a standard of righteousness that all have broken. Whereas the "Lord's Prayer" is a model; "after this manner pray ye." This is devotional, introspective and structural. Now surely these things cannot be taught after the same fashion! Furthermore, the area of interest should always be consulted. How can the child in the early "teens" be able to know or have an interest in the relationship of man and wife in dealing with the sixth commandment?

Another axiom, "One thing should be taught at a time." Take from "eternal condemnation" to "hallowed by thy name,"—is an unpardonable offense! One thing ought to be put within the

grasp of the pupil and one thing only! One pastor always explained to his class when treating the second article of the Creed, the "communicatio idiomatum"—in the words of the Litany "Good Lord deliver us!" Sacchini says "teachers should prefer to teach few things thoroughly to an indistinct impression of many." "The instruction should proceed from the known to the unknown—from the simple to the complex." The "Socratic method" surpasses all others: for it requires effort and calls for judgment. But it must never be forgotten that "What a learner discovers by mental exertion is better known than what is told to him." This enables a scholar to find himself. The one great feature is that the pupil advances in strength when he has reasoned it out. This is the contention of Cambridge for its method.

But another axiom is not to be overlooked, namely: "protracted exercise of the faculties is injurious; a change of occupation renews the energy of their action." Inattention is often the cry of nature for change. Restlessness may be the sign that examination might take place! The child wants to give as well as take.

The subject having been presented the question arises, has the teacher made the desired impression or has his work been in vain? An examination examines the teacher as much if not more than it does the pupil! But how proceed? One ever helpful way is to arouse discussion. Locke opposed it; but his opposition was probably against the Aristotelian quibbling of his day. Here nothing is forced; copying is impossible; interest is aroused; application is made; attention sustained. Thus the answers reveal where the teacher was misunderstood or the truth was misapplied. Another way is to raise doubt. This is a dangerous weapon though, and should be used only when the teacher has noticed that it was lurking in the child's mind and that it was not satisfied with the presentation. It must never be forgotten that a doubt raised and unanswered is a lasting stumbling-block! Then again it has a tendency to cultivate fault-finding and may make a cheap critic of the child. It is a good rule to present the positive things and those that may be for growth.

Examination "by the book" as a test of memory is an open question True it is a memory test; but is that education? In fact the place of memorizing is a much disputed subject. Montaigne, Ratich, Rosseau, and Herbert Spencer would have nothing committed to memory! Locke was opposed to committing

long passages to memory. Jacotot on the other hand made great demands on memory. He would have the child commit "Telemaque" to memory! One authority says, "We are learned, not so far as we know, but as we remember." Suffice to say rote-reciting is no test of knowledge and is worthless! "Knowledge of things and words must go together," says Comenius.

Then re-presentation follows and is a simple matter. It is not a review, however! The teacher makes his realignment. He notes the failure of improper or misunderstood presentation and the shortcomings of his pupils; and by a fresh analysis of the subject brings forth treasures, both old and new. The asserted is explained, new illustrations are given, the complex simplified, principles are coupled with applications. Like a skilled general, after the first charge is made he reassembles his forces and takes advantage of his own and his enemy's mistakes; and attacks with redoubled force on the weakest point presented!

We are conscious that, perhaps fifty points were touched in a very superficial way. Every one of them is worthy of amplification into a separate paper. But if we realize that the world is using millions in the public schools in applying these principles, works on pedagogy exceed all other publications, that the catechism is the one text-book of former days to stand the test of time, that readjustment is indeed a necessity, that the average seminary does not prepare catechisms and a change must take place, then this paper has not been in vain! When the Church makes up her honor roll the able catechist will stand in the front ranks. The Prussian school teacher won the battle of Sedan and the catechist must win the battle against modern doubt, unbelief, materialistic selfishness among men. Couple with the foregoing the consciousness of the Holy Spirit's presence, the promise that His word shall not return void, that God is in His Church, and we ought to do wonders for God and His Church and be workmen who need not be ashamed nor complain! Let us heed the words on Froebel's tombstone, "Come, let us live for our children."

New York City.

ARTICLE V.

LUTHER AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS.[1]

BY PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

There are two facts to be borne in mind in regard to Luther's whole attitude to social and economic questions. The first is that ordinarily this was a territory to be confined to experts, in which ministers should not meddle. He believed that a special knowledge was necessary to deal with some of these matters, and that they had better be left to those to whom Providence had assigned them, whether the jurists, those clever in worldly knowledge, or the authorities. The other fact is that the Church after all has social duties, and that Church and clergy must fight flagrant abuses and try to bring in the Kingdom of God on earth. The Church must use the Word of God against sin and sinners, and so by spiritual ministries help the needs of the time. The authorities on their part shall proceed by strict justice against evil doers. But there is another fact here which it is necessary to mention to get Luther's whole attitude, viz., that the State's function is not simply to administer justice, but to secure the general weal. They shall do the very best they can for their subjects, says Luther.[2] "The authorities shall serve their subjects and use their office not petulantly [nicht zu Mutwillen] but for the advancement of the common good, and especially for the poor."[3] The princes shall give laws which shall limit as far as possible social misery and national dangers. They should listen to the proposals of the Church to this end, and on the ground of wise counsels of churchmen, do away with old laws and make new ones. The Church does not have to make these laws or reform the secular life,—that can only be done by the State. But the Church uncovers social conditions, she shows dangers, she places aims before the State, she punishes and prays, and thus works upon the State. The latter takes up the matter, and by consci-

1 Reprinted by permission from the Papers of the American Society of Church History. Series ii, vol. ii. Copyright 1910, Saml. Macaully. Jackson, Sec'y.

2 *Erl. Ausg.* 23:296; 24:264.

3 38:324.

entious and strict use of her powers brings in a better order.[4] According to Luther, says Seeberg, the "Church has the holy task to fight against immorality, against poverty and misery. She does that inasmuch as she invokes every Christian, inasmuch as she forms organizations for the care of the suffering, and calls upon the State for effective interference. The work of the Inner Mission as well as the social work of the Church are inseparable from her nature, for she is entrusted with the task of preaching the Gospel."[5]

Though Luther felt a certain reserve, and urged on preachers the same reserve, in treating questions which might be left to legal and other authorities, he at the same time did not hesitate to declare himself on various matters in the economic, social, or political field. Let us take some of these economic questions.

Luther had a healthy appreciation of work, and broke completely with the mediaeval glorification of mendicancy. That was one of his chief services to mankind. "God has no use for the lazy, unfaithful idler, who does not do what he is commanded, but lets his hands and feet go." "House-servant and house-maid should have joy in their hearts that they serve, as Christ himself calls them. For priests, monks, and nuns might rejoice if they were in the same state. If you ask a house-maid why she washes the plates or milks the cow, she can say: I know that what I do pleases God, since I follow God's Word and command. That is a high, good and noble treasure, of which no one is worthy."[6] The work of hand-laborers is "pleasing and lovely; they live without care and without special encumbrance. For work strengthens the body and preserves health." The Roman Catholic dictum was: "Business which denies leisure is bad; only seek the true rest, which is God." Idleness may be better for the salvation of the soul than work, which is only valuable as a concession to the needs of life ,while to remain poor is a divine call as well as to work. Begging and idleness were therefore two of the curses of mediaeval life, as they are to-day in Roman Catholic lands. Eberlin of Gunzberg (about 1520) once answered the question why there was no money in the country by saying that only one in fifteen worked, the rest were idle. Luther had to com-

4 Seeberg, *Luther's Stellung zu den sittl. u. sozialen Nöten s. Zeit* in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* xii. (1901), 851.

5 *Ibid.,* 852.

6 *Erl. Ausg.,* 51:422.

plain over this Catholic inheritance, the natural results of this premium on idledness: "No one wants to work," he says; "therefore the landworkers must let their slaves [or servants, knechte] have plenty of holidays; then they are free and no one can control them. There is the greatest complaint over domestics and workmen, how disobedient, untrue, undisciplined, selfish they are; that is a plague from God."[7] On the other hand, Luther said: Work is divine; it is God's command; we cannot be too diligent; work belongs to human nature; as a bird to fly, so is a man born to work—there he finds his divine destination.[8] The body is made to work, which keeps it healthy.[9] But chiefly that we may serve our neighbor, and be uesful in our day; the householder to his family, the slave to his lord, the prince in the fulfilment of his duties. Christ shall not ask whether you are a man or woman, emperor or stable-man, mayor or constable,—simply be obedient to God where you are and do not renounce your calling.[10] If you do not work so that you may support yourself and have to give to the needy, you are no Christian, but a thief and a robber.[11] With these words Luther broke the spell of the mediaeval beggar saint. "Useless people, who serve neither to protect nor to nourish, but only consume, lounge around, or tramp, sohuld not be suffered, but be driven out of the land or made to work."[12] Roscher well says that in the matter of begging Luther is a turning-point to a higher social economy.[13] His work here had the significance of a revolution.

Of different kinds of work, Luther esteemed agriculture best, healthiest, more religious, nearer to nature, nearer to God. He says that it is not money and goods which nourish men, but God alone, so that man's good does not stand in human wit, but in God's blessing.[14] "Agriculture is a divine means of subsistence,

7 20:272 f.1

8 5:93; 20:284; 4:330; 13:95 etc.

9 4:380, etc.

10 *Erl. Ausg.*, 1:250; 52:112. See further in Ward, *Darstellung und Würdigung der Ansichten Luthers vom Staat u. seinen wirstschaftlichen Aufgaben*, Jena, 1898, 47 ff.

11 *Erl. Ausg.*, 9:319.

12 22:28; cf. 57:358; 20:286. See also Erhardt's putting of this side of Luther in his article on "The Economic Views of the Reformers" in *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1880, H. 4, 677 ff.

13 *Geschichte der Nationalökonomik in Deutschland*, München, 1874, 68.

14 *Erl. Ausg.*, 57:137. See Schmoller, *Zur Geschichte der nat. ökonom. Ansichten in Deutschland während der Reformationsperiod* in *Tübinger Zeitschrift* 1860, 474.

—it comes straight down from heaven."[15] "To cultivate the earth is a divine work, which God has commanded, according to Genesis i."[16] Therefore the peasant's work is the happiest, and "full of hope, for to sow, to plow, to plant, to graft, to mow, to cut, to thresh,—all that has great hope.[17] Therefore he thinks it would be better if there were fewer merchants and tradesmen and more farmers.[18]

But all other kinds of work have their place. The people form one body, and an overseer may be more useful than a hand-laborer. Then where would princes and nobles be if there were no ministers, teachers, farmers, artisans? Division of labor is necessary. I have cloth, but I could not make hose. "Therefore it is well ordered in the Latin lands that the tailors have a special guild which make hose and nothing else; here they make hose, doublet [jacket], and coat, all in one form and in one feat.[19] The higher forms of labor are much esteemed by Luther. "Next to the preaching office, I know that the work of the teacher is the most useful, the greatest, and the best?"[20] Physicians are also useful, and the lawyers are specially valuable in the protection of life, property, and virtue. For the same reason the worldly authorities are to be prized. This will explain also Luther's appreciation of the soldier. "Ah, war is like a golden hook, with which if a man fishes he does not get very much."[21] He frankly confesses that war is a great plague, but he adds: "We have also to see how much greater the plague from which war saves us."[22] For this reason war is just as necessary in its place as eating or drinking. So far as war is a war of necessity, one can fight even as a mercenary soldier. A warrior must have a good conscience, and must be sure he is serving God. The calling of a soldier in itself is just as honorable as any.[23] This does not mean that our Reformer was oblivious to the desolating influence of war. "May God turn away his wrath from us, for war is the greatest punish-

15 *Erl. Ausg.*, 57:342.
16 57:248.
17 61:352-3.
18 21:375.
19 See Schmoller, 484 ff.
20 *Erl. Ausg.*, 20:40.
21 62:173.
22 22:249.
23 22:273, 279, 282, 284.

ment, as it destroys religion and worldly and domestic rule. Everything goes under. Scarcity and pestilence are as a foxtail, —not to be compared to war."[24] Business of a jailer and executioner is also necessary.[25] It was Luther's glory to make divine the calling of the common man,—that the smith at his forge is as truly the servant of God and co-worker with Him as the monk at his prayers.

There were some businesses however, which Luther did not like. One of these was the usurer's or interest-taker's. I cannot go into the history of interest in the Christian Church. Suffice it to say that following the unanimous opinion of the Fathers, the mediaeval Church condemned all taking of interest, though she did not succeed in breaking up the practice even among her own members. In this matter Luther stood squarely with her, though Calvin did not. In the Middle Ages there was but little opportunity to lay out money productively, as there came to be with the new discoveries at the dawn of the modern era, and the great trade routes east and west. Before Luther's time the chief borrowers were the poor, and they borrowed not to start some money-making scheme but to live, to tide them over hard places. As long as husbandry was the chief business, and payments were made in kind, the taking of interest was really usury and exploitation of the poor. With the expansion of trade and the building up of great industries, a process which was going on rapidly in the sixteenth century, the situation changed; large monies were needed, and interest was charged as a matter of course. Luther inherited the old conception, and it is to the credit of his sense of justice and of mercy that he came out strongly against the practice. In three or four writings he struck it hard blows, in his long and in his short sermon on usury (or interest), in 1519,[26] in his book, *Von Kaufshandlung und Wucher*,[27] 1524, and in his appeal to the clergy, *An die Pfarrherrn wider den Wucher zu predigen*,[28] 1540.

In the first book (1519) he says that the spirit of "avarice

24 62:173.
25 22:73.
26 *Erl. Ausg.*, 20:89-122.
27 22:199-226.
28 23:282-338. The second book (1524) has been translated by Professor Carruth of the University of Kansas in the *Open Court* (Chicago), January, 1897, 16-34 (vol. xi.).

and interest [usury. Wucher] has not only mightily increased, but has understood how to seek a covering-board under which it, with the reputation of fairness, can carry on its evil. And so it has almost come about that we no longer regard the holy gospel. Therefore it is necessary in these dangerous times to show to every man how he can carry on business in temporal goods, making the right distinction, and carefully observing the holy Gospel of Christ our Lord." Notice the religious standpoint. He refers to Luke vi : 30 ff. as the great charter of non-interest loaning. A poor man has to borrow. "You should loan and expect nothing from it. It is usury all the same when you loan wine, corn (korn, wheat and other grains), money or whatnot to your neighbors for a year or a certain length of time, obligating or loading them with interest, that they must give back more or other than they have borrowed."[29] Such a proceeding is against love of the neighbor and against the natural law which Christ shows us in Luke vi :31 and Matt. vii :12. Against the objection that in non-interest loans a man loses the use of what he has loaned, he simply answers: "He who considers giving or loaning, must also have previously considered the interest, or he would neither give nor loan." Then when it is said that it is a custom for scholars, priests, Churches to loan for gain, Luther replies: "Well, it is neither Christian, nor godly, nor natural, and against this no example can help."[30]

The second part of the sermon he considers Zinskauf or Rentenkauf, the letting out of capital or goods for yearly return, or selling on credit with interest, or, as Erharddt explains it, [31] a laying out of capital for interest upon real property (apparently the same as our mortgage), only with this difference from the present form of such loaning, that the creditor was looked upon as the legal possessor of the property, and had a claim upon a regular income either in kind or in money. This, Luther says, is a pretty way of loading other people without apparent sin, and becoming rich without any cost to oneself. In this case the debtor gives over to the creditor the use of some property, which he can claim again after he has paid what he owes; or it takes the form of a personal interest claim which is liquidated by the

29 *Erl. Ausg.*, 20:105.
30 20:107.
31 Erhardt, 704.

activity of the debtor in industry, art, or handwork. Sometimes it is a steady payment of interest in money. The time in which all these forms of Rentenkauf may run is sometimes for life or forever. There was much discussion of the permissibility of these forms of gain in the sixteenth century, and Church ordinances generally held them valid under certain conditions. Luther, however, had no patience with them. He thinks Rentenkauf increases only goods, the honor of men, and luxury gives occasion to avarice; for the creditor in these transactions "never or but seldom considers the advantage and help of the buyer, but only his own." Besides, this kind of selling for revenue is in its effect only usury or interest after all, and it brings all lands, cities, people under burdens, exhausts and destroys them.[32] "Selling on credit has brought the greatest misery to the German nation. But for this, many would have left unbought their silk, velvet, cloth of gold, spices, and other pomps. It arose only a little over a hundred years ago, and has already brought all princes, cities, etc., into poverty, distress, and destruction."[33] So also going surety is a bad thing, for it has brought many people down.[34] The result of this revenue (buying or selling on credit) was a kind of mortgage on land under which German agriculture suffered much.

The letting out of money, etc., on interest is objectionable in Luther's eyes also because the gain is on the creditor's side and all the loss on the debtor's. He says the interest payer is subject to God's power, to death, sickness, water, fire, wind, hail, lightning, storms, wolves, and bad men;—all this danger the money-lord should assume.[35] But Luther did not deny absolutely all profit from interest, though he so protected the debtor that he took away most of the stimulus to the loaner to peel the less fortunate. The creditor cannot demand the principal back at any one time,—that must be left to the discretion of the borrower.[36] This is on the ground that the former has an equal risk. But at the same time the debtor must do everything possible to live up to his contract, must not deviate from it because he thinks it is unjust, but must be thoroughly obedient to all his duties. The

32 *Erl. Ausg.*, 20:110.
33 21:356.
34 22:213.
35 20:115.
36 57:360.

authorities, however, should see to it that all unjust burdens and interest are done away, for it is their duty to punish the wrong and protect the right.[37] When one's capital is his or her only stock in trade, as for instance in the case of a widow, then its letting out at interest is justifiable.[38] Here the moral dangers to the creditor do not exist, and Luther's sense saw that interest in these cases was an economic necessity.

Besides the usurer's, the importer's trade did not stand high with Luther. This simple peasant's son did not have much use for luxury. He does not like the over-sea trade with India, "which brings costly silk, gold-work, spices, which are of no use and only serve pomp, and drain the land and people of money." "England would have less gold, if Germany did not import its cloth. And the king of Portugal would not be so lifted up if we let him keep his spices." "These foreign wares are of no use, but they grind us down."[39] Playing and dancing Luther also wanted to restrain,[40] as also immoderate eating and drinking, for as a fact, he says, "other nations, particularly the Latin lands, have a great politeness, and they have a spite against us whom they call 'the full Germans.' "[41]

Connected with this suspicion against luxury and wealth, Luther did not like great business houses, large importing firms, or concerns which had a monopoly in whole or in part. In 1512 the Reichstag at Cologne declared against these companies, as the United States Government has against the Standard Oil Company. The Diet said that within a few years past, great societies of merchants have arisen in the empire which have in their hands alone all kinds of wares, spices, metal, woollens, etc., that they drive trade in them, and according to their own pleasure and for their own advantage, determine the price of such goods, and this is against the holy Empire, the imperial right, and all power—in which words one might almost hear the voice of Roosevelt. Luther agreed heartily with the Reichstag in this deliverance: "We must put a bridle in the mouth of the Fuggers and companies like them. How is it possible in one man's lifetime to collect together such a heap of wealth, if the thing is done

37 *Erl. Ausg.*, 23:27.
38 54:277;55:11 f.
39 22:181, 201.
40 5:95; 57:359.
41 8:283; cf. 21:357; 57:360-1.

godly and rightly? How can one hundred gulden gain twenty in one year?[42] (Similar questions have often been asked since in America.) "Of other companies I could say much, for all of them are inexcusable, for they act in avarice and injustice, in which nothing of a good conscience is to be found. For they have all wares in their own hands, and make what they will, and increase or lessen their stock at pleasure, and oppress and destroy the small merchants just as the pike does the small fish. Therefore no one dare ask how with a good conscience he can be in such companies. If these firms remain, right and honor go under, if the latter abide, then the companies must go."[43] One can readily understand with what burning words Luther would scoriate that great American monopoly, whose history has been marked by the most unscrupulous destruction of all competitors in its field that has probably ever been known.[44]

Luther had no patience with the motto of some modern railroads and other corporations: Charge all that the traffic will bear. He says that the common rule of merchants is: I sell my wares as dear as I can. He replies to that that such a rule "makes room for avarice and opens the door and window to hell," though all business is run under it. Merchants should not go beyond the common market price, and should charge "according to the time and greatness of the work" represented in the article. Better still it would be, if the authorities fixed the price by the judgment of experts, in which Luther anticipated the laws of Congress and State Legislatures in regard to railroad charges.[45]

There was nothing specially new in Luther's views in this branch of economics. It was the teaching of the canonists of the Middle Ages that the worth of a thing is dependent on the value of the stuff used in it, and the pains and work that it cost. Competition as a factor in the fixing of price, and subjective lust of gain, were excluded. Nor should the price be reckoned according to anticipated payment or payment on credit or contract. The Roman Catholic Church had the right and duty to watch over trade, just as the modern State claims and uses that right for itself. Of course more or less give-and-take bargaining was al-

42 *Erl. Ausg.*, 21:357.
43 22:223-4.
44 See among others the great book of the late Henry Demarest Lloyd, *Wealth against Commonwealth*, New York, 1894.
45 *Erl. Ausg.*, 22:203-4, 206, 215, 218 f.

lowed, and market fluctuations were made use of, but the effort of the Church was to fix prices as objectively as possible.[46] Luther had the same idea. "How high thy price should be in trade or work," he said, "thou canst better reckon when thou considerest the time and amount of work, and takest the parable of a common day-laborer who works and sees what the day earns. Reckon then how many days the thing cost, and how much work and danger it represents; for the greater the work, the longer the time, the greater the reward or price."[47] Here Luther takes the day's work of the common man as the foundation for the fixing of price, in which he anticipated Adam Smith. Luther was the enemy of great fortunes. He says that more than a fair living is not to be looked for by trade or merchandise, and that every preference by which we get an advantage over another is to be avoided.[48]

I said a moment ago that Luther taught that the best way to fix prices is the judgment of fair-minded experts, or those that passed for such. This method was frequently in use in the Middle Ages, and was provided for in Calvin's legislation in Geneva.[49] It appears that it was not practicable in Germany, and therefore Luther thought the next best thing was to go according to the market, or according to the custom of the land.[50] No one can put up his prices to get advantage of the general need,—that is theft and robbery.[51] Nor can one cause an artificial scarcity for personal profit, such as farmers who waste grain in order to make it dear.[52] Also those who get one kind of goods in their own hands and then advance the price are transgressors against the public weal and should be punished. These merchants act as though the blessings of God were for them alone.[53] All monopolists are not worthy to be called men. They ought to be driven out of the land.[53] Luther lived in a transition time—a time when the simple ways of the fathers were yielding before the commerce of many lands and the increased wealth thus resulting. This disturbed the old economic relations. This dis-

46 See Ward, 74-5.
47 *Erl. Ausg.*, 22:206.
48 22:203.
49 Elster in Conrad's *Jahrbüchern*, 1878, 180.
50 *Erl. Ausg.*, 20:204.
51 57:343.
52 57:339.
53 22:216, 218.

turbance the conservative Luther tried to reduce to a minimum by holding on to the old ideals, by keeping a sharp watch over the great merchants and would-be monopolists, and by a legal limitation of luxury,—all of which revealed his sound moral and religious sense and his sympathy with the common man.

The right of private property Luther allowed to the full. That right rested on work, on the precepts of the Scripture, on the duty of providing for one's own and of giving to the needy.[54] Communism is unnatural and impossible. Men are not all equal, for God has created them different, and this difference or inequality remains.[55] Nor is communism inculcated in the Scripture,—it was simply voluntary for those disciples who wished it (Acts iv:32), not for Pilate and Herod and other outsiders, as our foolish peasants storm.[56] The example in Acts iv. is not binding, though mutual helpfulness is.[57] Family life excludes communism, says Luther.[58] However, in case of extreme need, ordinary laws do not hold,—reminding one of the mediaeval proverb: In extreme necessity all things are common. Luther says: "Necessity breaks iron, and can well break a law. What is right in a time of necessity may not be right in ordinary times. Who takes bread from the store without being driven by hunger is a thief, but otherwise he does right, because we are under obligation to give to him. And so with other things. But those who need should seek out princes, ministers, and pious learned people."[59] This reminds us of the sensation caused in England a few years ago by the remark of Cardinal Manning that the starving have a natural right to bread, or, to put it in his own words, that "every man has a right to work or to bread.";[60] but people forgot that in saying that, he was only repeating the axiom of the canon law of his own Church, or the foundation principle on which society rests. At any rate, Luther said as much. But in regard to communism Luther worked as a thoroughly conservative force.

But this did not mean that Luther was averse to municipal

54 31:398-9.
55 2:83; 50:185-6.
56 Cf. 31:299.
57 6:97.
58 6:96.
59 *Erl. Ausg.*, 23:307.
60 Purcell, *Life Cardinal Manning*, Lond., 1896, ii., 656.

provisions for the common good. He placed the care of the poor on the community. "Every city and borough," he says, "must build its own churches, towers, and bells, and care for its own poor,"—not the Church as such, but the whole place as a civic entity. So far as this work has to do with the poor, it must be guided by a wise Christian spirit. Some competent man must be set over it who shall make personal investigation of needs. This man may well be a church officer. Such a social deacon Luther esteemed highly. He says: "After the preaching office there is no higher office in the Church than this poor-administration, so that Church goods are rightly and honestly looked after, to the end that poor Christians who cannot make their own living may be helped, so as not to suffer need." Whence shall these resources come? From foundations and legacies, which should be turned from the churches and monasteries to the poor, from voluntary contributions, from assessments laid as a matter of duty on the citizens, and from a union of neighboring communities to look after this matter by a poor-tax. In this way Luther laid the foundation for a new method with the poor, which lifted the latter from the chances of wayside charity and made their support a matter of right.[61]

Speaking of Luther not being averse to municipal experiments for the common good reminds us that the semi-socialistic provision at Leisnig met his warm approval. With the emptying of the monasteries and the lapse of other old religious foundations, the question came up, What shall be done with their property and income? In Leisnig it was determined to found a common chest from which the town would wisely supply the needs of the citizens. Two nobles, two counsellors, three citizens, and three peasants were a committee of administration. The first provision was that the congregation or community should have full power to call, induct, or dismiss their pastors, and to see to it that in every house God's Word should be used for instruction and reformation of life. In the churches two boxes were to be placed for gifts of bread, cheese, eggs, meat, and two offertory cases for money for the common chest, as well as for the regular offering. The president had to distribute the victuals to the poor, and on Sunday exhort to the honor of God and love to the

61 See Paret, *Der Einfluss der Reformation auf die Armenpflege*, Stuttgart, 1896, 20-2.

neighbor. From the chest the church buildings were to be kept up, and the salaries of the ministers and sextons paid. This salary was to be a fixed sum, with no leeway for gifts or fees. All begging is prohibited. But all the poor are to be carefully looked after, and all orphan children educated and trained in handwork. Artisans and peasants hard-pressed shall have money advanced to them, and if they without fault of their own are incapable of paying they shall be excused the debt. Strangers shall also be helped in a similar way. Purchases shall be made for the common good, in cheap years provisions bought up and used for the needs of the whole community. All are obligated to regular contributions.

Now this was a pretty thorough-going socialism for that time. What was Luther's attitude toward it? Cordial. He praised it highly. He hoped that this would be an example to other towns how they could administer and use the churchly wealth. The old monks, who had not themselves freely left the cloister, should be carefully taken care of. From the city monasteries schools for both boys and girls should be provided. The Leisnig ordinance paved the way to the modern method of dealing with the problem of poverty, viz., as an affair of the whole community,—every congregation responsible for its own poor. Both schools and the poor are the subject of common civic and ecclesiastical concern,—an idea which revolutionized this branch of economics. Luther's hearty support of the Leisnig socialism reveals a side to him not often mentioned. At the same time he was far from putting a premium on poverty, as we have seen. The poor should have from the public enough for life, but their lot should not be made so easy that they would prefer poverty to work.[62]

Professor Nikolaus Müller of Berlin has discovered that not only Leisnig but also Wittenberg had its common chest. As early as January, 1521, there was in the latter city an *Ordnung des gemeinen Beutels zur Erhaltung Hausund anderer armer bedürftiger Leute zu Wittenberg,* though this had only to do with the poor. There were to be reputable overseers elected, who

62 *Erl. Ausg.,* 21:336. Luther published the Leisnig ordinances with a preface, 22:105 ff. (*Ordnung eines gemeinen Kastens,* 1523, reprinted in Lietzmann's admirable series of Kleine Texte für theol. Vorlesungen und Uebungen, Bonn, 1908), and information will be found in Ward, 90 ff.; Braasch, Luther's *Stellung zum Sozialismus,* Braunschweig, 1897, 146 ff.; Köstlin, *Martin Luther,* 5 Aufl., i., 550 f.

should help the poor intelligently with careful discrimination, based on a visit to their homes. Money should be contributed for this common object, and grain and wood should be purchased by the city for this purpose. The preachers are to exhort the people and make them considerate. For the success of the plan almost everything depends on the preachers and overseers.[63]

Both the Leisnig and Wittenberg ordinances show Luther in the role of a civic semi-socialist reformer. City and congregation as a common body functionized as a paternal society. They looked after the income of the congregation and the systematic care of the poor. This latter is no *opus operatum,* no religious tribute to conscience or to purgatory, but an organized ethical act of the whole community. Not only the poor, but also (in Leisnig) artisans and peasants who needed temporarily a helping hand should receive it. "That is a new principle," says Seeberg, "a churchly-social thought. It is the duty of the society (or congregation) not only to help when the need is already present, but also to reach out assistance as a prophylactic against the future. In other words, not only mission, but also social, work is the task of the congregation."[64]

In the matter of capital, Luther never got far beyond the mediaeval view. Not that he shared the mediaeval praise of poverty as a special virtue, or looked upon the generous bestowal of one's goods on the Church as the chief end of life, but that he held that naive attitude toward nature and the simple life which was the ruling one at a time when men lived near the soil, and large accumulations of capital were unknown, and were useless in any case. In some cases there had been an advance, and large business houses, like the famous firm of the Fuggers, sprang up. But this tendency Luther did not like. To keep near to nature, to carry on a small business in simplicity, industry, and piety, was his ideal. "Of the productivity of capital," says Roscher, "Luther had as little conception as the strict canon law."[65] Still he had some conception of the place of capital, as he vindicates interest in case of necessity, such, for instance, as that of a widow

63 Seeberg, 841-2. Reprinted in his *Aus Religion und Geschichte,* 1906, 259.

64 Seeberg, 842-3.

65 *Gesch. der Nationalökonomik in Deutschland,* München, 1874, 59.

left with a small property, who has the right to put her wealth where it will bring her in a living.[66]

In general it may be said of Luther's social-economic views that they were neither modern nor revolutionary. For the most part they marked a continuity with the Middle Ages, not a break. Of course his abolition of monasticism and celibacy and his treatment of work and poverty were really both modern and revolutionary, and all this had beneficent and far-reaching consequences even in the economic world. His judgment of economic questions was ethical and religious. What the Scriptures prescribed, according to his understanding of them, was valid. When either party—noble or peasant—went beyond or contradicted this norm they were self-condemned. As the Saviour did not lay down a social program, neither would he. As Christ and the apostles did not abolish slavery, neither would he abolish the Feudal System.[67] But Church and clergy had social duties; they must work for social betterment; they must abate wrongs; they must preach obedience, peace, brotherhood, love. But they do not have to create new social institutions. That is the work of the State with the advice of experts. Princes and the Reichstag must do away with usury and credit; they must regulate prices, watch over trade, and punish evil. "May God give again an Alexander or a Solon to restrain or prevent usury." Jurists, not preachers, have to decide such matters.[68] The State must advance to help the people. It is not for itself, but for the common weal. It must abate social ills, do away with abuses, bad laws, etc., helped by the Church as spiritual leader and inspirer, not as head nor dominator.

Luther was not infallible. Some of his views were mistaken and have been long since outgrown. But it is doubtful whether, after all, the modern minister can do better than follow some of the main lines of his teaching: (1) Church and clergy must understand the social conditions of their age. (2) They must give their faithful testimony as to the moral and religious demands of Christianity. They shall call sin sin, misery misery. "They should not bend before the age-spirit and its idols, nor stoop before the rich and mighty, before science and popular favor."[69]

66 *Erl. Ausg.*, 23:306.
67 24:281.
68 20:117, 122; 22:204; 23:284, 296 ff.; 24:282.
69 Seeberg, 855. Also in his *Aus Geschichte*, etc., 273.

Luther's reproofs of governments and overgrown mercantile establishments, of interest and revolutionary peasants, were perhaps at times one-sided, but they showed the greatness of the man. They were the expression—whether mistaken or not— of great ethical and religious principles, and these are the preacher's throne. (3) Nor need the Church hold back to-day from favoring actual remedies for economic grievances that look toward socialism, any more than she did at Leisnig and Wittenberg, but as to details of social adjustments, she had better leave these to statesmen, jurists, and other experts. (4) The State must address itself to evils in this field with determined earnestness. President Roosevelt's reformatory activity against the exploitation of the public by the great corporations is in the spirit and power of Luther. It would have made him shout for joy. (5) Preacher, statesman, social reformer, must ever keep his faith bright in God, and in His leading of the world through law and ordered progress.

Madison, N. J.

ARTICLE VI.

THE PEDAGOGIC VALUE OF BLOODY SACRIFICE; A STUDY IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

BY JOHN R. BRAEUER, M.LITT., PH.D.

The rationale of bloody sacrifice as an expiatory measure rests, above all things, on the use and purpose one finds in religion itself. Why cultivate religion? What is its ultimate end in the evolution of the individual and the race as a whole? The question may be answered in one word: redemption. The summum bonum of all life, the essence of what is called "eternal life" was voiced by the "only begotten" Son of God in the majestic words, "Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." John 16, 33. They flowed from his consciousness of psychic victory, his absolute triumph over every form of earthly depression, his imperturbability of mind amid the crash of worlds, his repose in God alone. The complete redemption of the soul is a condition of perfect harmony in ourselves with every impinging force on the wide periphery of universal life; it would embrace a relation of peace with God and man, a smooth adjustment to every circumstance of life, duty, experience and destiny. To effect our complete redemption is the motive of all religion; such is the kingdom to be built within us; and only in whatever degree we attain this victory by means of religion, do we lay hold of the realities of life, the life eternal, by which, though we die, the survival of personality shall flow on through the aeons of eternity. I resume, therefore, religion makes for redemption.

Now it is the genius of religion to touch man as it finds him; grovelling in lowliness, driven by fears, in bondage to his appetites. The potency of Jesus was a healing virtue; the Word made flesh ministered to the infirmities of his brethren in the flesh. Not to amuse the righteous, but to heal the sick, the blessed Savior lived His lowly life. A direct and fundamental proof of the divine origin of Christianity may be found in the fact that it alone is adjusted to every need of man, for the Creator knew what was in man. Pascal, while approaching this subject from another point of view, said with deep insight, "The

whole course of things should bear upon the establishment and exaltation of religion; the opinions and feelings of men should be found conformable to what religion enjoins; and, in a word, religion should be so manifestly the great object and center toward which all things tend, that whosoever understands its principles, should be enabled to account by it for the nature of man in particular, and for the government of the world at large." (Thoughts on Rel. ch. 3). Setting in where man actually finds himself, Christianity takes hold and begins to fit him for his higher destiny. To deal with humanity in its original instincts is the legitimate method of saving grace.

It is impossible to trace the origin of our consciousness of sin; the story of the fall, while it registers the awakening of man to it, leaves a basic mystery pending. It had to be; sin exists and man is conscious of it as being an injury to God. This consciousness, moreover, is a wholesome experience, for in promulgating a moral law through Moses God gave the world a schoolmaster unto Christ. The instinct of sin-consciousness, being the source of man's alienation from God in thought and feeling, became the negative pole, which, counteracted by the opposite one of saving grace, set the pendulum of spiritual life swaying. It produced a process moving toward redemption.

Basing our investigation on the primal instinct by which man conceives God injured, we run up against the custom of expiatory sacrifice, as it was practiced from the earliest days of history. We cannot fix the point where human sacrifice began nor can we estimate its scope; neither may one decide conclusively, whether animal sacrifice was always a substitute for human victims. We do know that the Grecian Dionysos cult, which entailed the consuming of raw meats for sacrificial purposes, was a remnant of human sacrifice among that people. Themistocles offered three prisoners to Bacchus Omestes, as Plutarch tells us. (Them. 13 Pelop. 21). Dionysos worship at Boeotia and still later at Lesbos and Tenedos was associated with human sacrifices. From the data we may infer that among the Greeks at least, whose religion was taken over largely from Asiatic sources, the nature of the crime to be atoned for determined the quality and character of the offering. The need of atoning for the sin of an entire nation, for instance, required a more precious form of offering, the value being enhanced when the person volunteered.

As to sacrifices among the Hebrews, one must exercise care to distinguish between eucharistic-federative and expiatory offerings. The sacrific of Cain and Abel, assuming for the moment that this is one of our earliest data, is called minchah, a thank offering, although it was, in part at least, bloody. Noah's sacrifice after the flood was a covenantal rite. (Gen. 8). That of Isaac stands by itself (Gen. 22); in principle, it seems to have been a voluntary surrender of an only son of Abraham's part and a willing dedication of himself on Isaac's; the expiatory idea does not appear to have entered here. The first explicit motive for expiation we meet in the early record of Job's sacrifices for his children and friends. (Job 1:5-48). But we deal here with Chaldaic origins. The case of Jephthah and his daughter is anomalous.

The threads of our argument for the pedagogic value of bloody sacrifice will have to be gathered, as we recall the factors Moses, under God, was called to cognize, when he became the welder of Hebrew religion. There can be no conscience without an underlying consciousness of sin. To evolve a conscience, tender and acute, he gave the law in commandments, which, working as a ferment in the hearts of the people, steadily strengthened that prerequisite of conscience which is sin-consciousness. For the law stigmatizes sin; it exalts the standard of Jehovah's righteousness and reflexively humbles man; it increases that "sense of absolute dependence" which Schleiermacher, erroneously however, held to be the essence of all religion. The law created that sense of the wrath of Jehovah so graphically expressed in the anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament. But this was by no means the only psychic factor Moses should sway for ultimate redemption. Sin-consciousness imparts a sting, which gives rise to the impulse in man to placate the Deity. A psychic fear, hovering over the dark gulf between man and his injured God, clamors for expulsion. Thus the yearning for reconciliation, for the appeasement of the Creator is another primal instinct of our nature. Whether such a pacifying of divine wrath is at all necessary, speaking in the absolute, is not the question here; it is enough that we recognize the fact that such a need is felt in human nature. Man feels he must give up some adequate offering to annul the injury he feels he has done to God. And in the scale of worth nothing exceeds the price of

blood. Blood was considered to be the seat of life. Gen. 9:5. The Israelites were forbidden to eat it in any form: "And ye shall eat no manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast, in any of your dwellings." Lev. 7:25. Hence nothing but blood could serve as a fit offering to reconcile the Deity, and the Levitical system included it for these reasons. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." Lev. 17:11.

At this point, it will be necessary, for the sake of clarity, to anticipate our ultimate conclusion regarding the pedagogical value of blood shedding. The end of man's original creation is his final redemption. This is brought about by psychic evolution through the pedagogic service of religion. Bloody sacrifice, being an important factor in religion, must have, if it be legitimate, a pedagogic function, emancipating the soul from an imperfect to a more and more perfected adjustment and harmony with God. "Wo immer," says Eucken in his 'Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion, "die Religion mehr ist als Spiel und Ergoetzung, da steht der Begriff des Opfers im Vordergrunde."

The whole Levitical plan of the Old Testament culminates in sacrifice effected by the shedding of blood. But its tone and symbolic import are far above the conception of pagan nations. We are quite safe in saying that no human sacrifices ever occurred among the Hebrews by suggestion or indulgence of the official priesthood, save the death of our Lord. Moses once for all abolished human sacrifice by instituting the pedagogic device of animal offerings. The Levitical forms applied what the story of the offering of Isaac implied, namely that the ram should be slaughtered in place of or as a substitute for the boy. To expect the Israelites, ever tempted to retrograde by reason of their pagan environment, to apprehend anything like our New Testament conception of sacrifice, would have been untimely and futile; besides their potent primal instincts could not be modified without centuries of training.

It is interesting to observe how God gradually prepared the way for a higher stage of redemption by the increasing penetration of revealed truth. Much has been said in recent criticism about the antagonism of the Hebrew prophets to the sacerdotal system. Running their course side by side, sacerdotalism, crippled

by legalistic degeneration and exhausted in its vital message by the later born Gospel of the prophets, had to fall behind and lose the race. But it was a struggle of years. What Bossuet says about the Gospel, may be applied to prophecy, "It is only in the Gospel that we get the final and real freedom; it was accomplished quietly; the old forms were not destroyed utterly, but undermined." (Faith of the Modern Protestant, page 76). Prophecy simply lifted the veil, which Moses, by mystic device, had drawn around a truth of original intuition. It abrogated the symbol. The teaching of the prophets anticipates what is fundamental and permanent in the whole plan of reconciliation. Herbert Spencer said, "The ultimate form of the religious consciousness is to find the development of a consciousness, which at the outset contained a germ of truth obscured by multitudinous errors. Errors they hardly were, these rites and sacrifices, but stepping-stones of progress in the training of the select people. How discerning is the teaching of the prophet Micah! "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before Him with burnt offering, with calves of a year old? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God." (6:7). In a general way, the prophetic denunciation of contemporary sacrifices was directed chiefly against the opus operatum vogue, which held to the letter, but set at naught the spiritual purport. But the full content of their message is not exhausted in this interpretation; there was present also the germ of a new truth: that the dedication of self is, after all, the only required offering.

And thus we approach the "fulness of time," when the "Lamb of God foreordained before the foundation of the world," (I Pet. 1:20), or as it is more strikingly put in Rev. 13:8, "slain from the foundation of the world," stepped on the stage of history. The long pending antagonism between the Mosaic ordinance of animal sacrifice and the prophetic vision of our complete self-dedication to God was now to be solved forever in the life and death of Jesus Christ.

A new order of things began with the era of John the Baptist. He invested the ancient custom of baptism with a content in that it should signify or attest the individual's surrender in will to God; we behold the germic thought of the prophets henceforth being enforced with authority. He baptized unto the remission of sins those who repented and gave themselves by a new obedience to God; and Jesus, beginning the great work of final deliverance, came to Jordan, submitting to baptism at the hands of John. Our Lord there expressed the solemn intention of which his whole life became the glorious fulfillment. This is highly significant. Having by that act put himself in line with the teaching of the prophets, his attitude to the traditional system of animal sacrifices becomes a matter of concern. Did Jesus endorse them?

He said he came not to destroy, but to fulfill, i. e., to fill-full. He was not born to be an iconoclast, ruthlessly shattering the scaffold, on which the household of faith through the pedagogic system of Mosaic sacrifices was built up; he came to fulfill. His method tended to render the one obsolete by creating the better and the more real. He matched the antitype to the type. Therefore Jesus never pronounced Himself in explicit words against sacrifices, as they were carried on in the temple. But did he endorse them?

Observing baptism, fasting, the Sabbath and other customs, he omitted, if the silence of the Gospels may be adduced in proof, the practice of Levitical sacrifice. It is true, on the eve of His passion He ordered the paschal lamb to be slain, but in the very act of its intended observance according to ancient vogue, he merged the Mosaic rite in the New Testament in His blood, the memorial supper. At what age His Messianic consciousness, awake already in the synagogue at Nazareth, conceived also the need of the final blood offering for the sin of the world, we can not tell; but we are informed how the vision of His suffering and death gradually took shape before His mind. At this point, the historic cleansing of the temple throws a flood of light on the question. There sat the money-changers and those who sold the animals for sacrifice—a legitimate traffic and necessary for the sacrificial vogue. Jesus indignantly overthrew their tables and seats, saying, "It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer but ye made it a den of robbers." Here, then,

was a clash with contemporary sacerdotalism. "My house shall be called a house of prayer." They had turned it into a shamble for sacrifice. Little wonder, that the gulf between the prophet and the priesthood widened, the latter venting their last curses on Him before Pontius Pilate. To abolish the sacrificial system, they realized, meant to uproot their hierarchy and their prestige among the people. The thrust touched the vitals of sacerdotalism.

Enough said, our Lord saw clearly that the final redemption of the human race demanded that the deliverer should give His life "as a ransom for many." To that pointed the finger of prophecy from the past; to that pointed forward the need of mankind's redemption. Sin is too mighty; the instinct for an appeasement too dominant that without the shedding of blood the peace of sonship ever should fall on man. Hence the dedication of our Savior's life to holiness of thought and deed was not sufficient to complete His Messianic mission. The prophet had to turn priest, in order that the bondage of the soul to all priestly rites might be abolished. The death of Christ was prophetically, historically, pedagogically necessary.

We are chiefly concerned here about the pedagogical side of His sacrificial death. Wherein consists that worth for the world's redemption?

We saw how Moses overcame the cruel practice of human sacrifice by the pedagogical device of animal sacrifice. Satisfying the deep-rooted instinct for propitiating God, he accustomed the Jews to the idea of substitution and vicariousness. And where the Mosaic dispensation ends, the sacrificial work of Christ begins. The cross of Christ is the greatest fact in the realm of spiritual truth. Every need of our nature, every fear, every form of spiritual bondage is dissipated by the magic of the cross. Every belief attached to it works a deliverance of some kind. Every hope staked on it is salutary. It cleanses the vision to our perfect sonship. It effects the true at-one-ment.

The death of Christ, in effect, annulled all sacrifices in the world. It made a priesthood unnecessary. It took the life out of paganism. Wherever men are led to believe that Christ's death is the final sacrifice, they no longer attempt any sacrifices. Imagine the waste of life, the cruelty, the superstition annihilated in the world by accepting Christ's sacrifice. The central thought

of the epistle to the Hebrews revolves around this point: the eternal validity of Christ's atoning death. The pierced hands and feet of Mary's son stopped streams of human and animal blood, which still might flow, had not God in Christ rendered Himself the object of a delivering belief.

Such a belief was the more readily accepted, because our Lord's person satisfied all the ethical demands made by human nature for a valid offering. His life was blameless. He died at the prime of life. He was the first-born of Mary. He reproduced the ideal of Adam's perfection. He gave His life voluntarily. Surely human nature could not seek a better offering. His blood was beyond price. There lies a solace for the guilty conscience, the assurance attested.

The question whether, in the absolute sense, bloody sacrifice was at all necessary, may here be put. Undoubtedly scholastic theology gave to blood-shedding an aspect incompatible with a high moral concept of God. All depends, whether one view the subject sub specie Dei or sub specie humani generis, as Spinoza would have phrased it. Sub specie Dei no sacrifice was ever necessary; sub specie humani generis it certainly was. Our Lutheran theology has the merit of beginning with man's need and matching God's gracious help to that need in history. In the condition of our ultimate redemption no need for a bloody sacrifice will be felt. But the actual sin-laden lot of man made the Mosaic and the Messianic offerings necessary. Their significance is chiefly pedagogical in the divine economy. We are saved by faith; man is advanced through delivering beliefs.

To eliminate the doctrine of the atonement from modern religious training, is to anticipate ultimate conditions. The schooling of the race has only begun. No sophistry can palliate sin. The atoning death of our Lord is a cardinal truth to be maintained at all odds, lest God's eternal plan should be hindered. We shall summarize under two heads:

First, the death of Christ consummates, demonstrates and for all time actualizes the essential nature of the sacrifice God demands of all His children: dedication of themselves to Him. Christ became obedient unto the death of the cross. He lived the self-surrendered life. He is God's beloved Son, in whom He is well pleased. The maxim of His conduct is fit to become a universal law.

Secondly, His death is mystically potent. He is also the Savior. A quickening influence passes from Him upon the soul of man; impulses, wholly foreign to any other thought, are instilled. We may not be able to explain the fact, but experience attests that the thought of His death, conceived as an atonement divinely rendered, penetrates into the hidden, deep recesses of the soul, where lie the springs of the moral will. It produces, as Dr. James would say, "the melting mood." Blood shed for sin causes a shudder, imbues sin with a crimson hue, brings home with a horror the ancient curse of the law and a keen sense of the justice of God; but, contemplated from the aspect of divine love as the anterior motive of history and life, the sacrifice of Christ urges with power the evangelical message that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." And love begets love. Self-will breaks and a new love of righteousness emerges as the morning from the womb of dying night. Right here religion and science meet. The religious phenomenon can not be realized except by a psychological explanation. The purely psychic touches the purely physical. The Infinite mysteriously vitalizes the finite.

The fallacy in present theological argument is the manifest dearth of a sense of the temporary value of purely psychic factors. The absolute is too often mingled with the historical. Men err in trying to effect the ultimate and the ideal without the temporary expedient. The fact that religion as God's pedagogical method of world redemption must be expected to meet the actual needs of the present world, is generally forgotten. The need of the day is to set the atonement of Christ into its proper historical and pedagogical focus. The pastor who mistakenly excludes from the message of his pulpit the doctrine of the atonement, throws away the golden key that opens the sluices of the heart from which the tears of repentance flow, throws away the magic wand that produces the springtime of the soul with the flowers of all Christian graces, throws away what can most conduce to bring on the

> "One far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

Seattle, Wash.

ARTICLE VII.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS.

BY C. W. SIFFERD, D.D.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in the great commonwealth of Illinois made its first appearance in organized form in 1819, in Union county, thirty miles north of Cairo, the southern limit of the State, eleven miles from the Mississippi and twenty-five miles from the Ohio Rivers. The historian of the Hillsboro, Ill., Church makes that the first Lutheran Church in Illinois, but the facts seem to make St. John's, Union county fourteen years older. One was organized in 1819 the other—Hillsboro—in 1833. In the year 1817 a number of Lutheran people came from North Carolina and settled in Union county. Soon others followed, until, in 1819, enough were found in the community to organize a Lutheran congregation. At an unknown date previous to this a number of families from adjacent States settled in this particular portion of the county, but the great earthquake of 1811, which caused the water of the Mississippi to run up stream for a time, so frightened them that they went elsewhere leaving their little log houses vacant. In 1814 Mr. and Mrs. George Hunsaker, Baptists, he from Pennsylvania, she from South Carolina, having met and married in Kentucky a few years previous, arrived. They held the fort alone until three years later the first Lutheran people came from North Carolina and occupied the vacant houses and took possession of the country.

WHO THESE PEOPLE WERE.

To answer this question we must needs go back to Pennsylvania in the year 1747 and we will find in and about Reading and Allentown and Easton a preparation for migrating to North Carolina. The four and five horse wagons are loaded with the most needed possessions and all things are ready for the journey. Along with each wagon the best family cow follows, being tied to the rear of the wagon. But in a few days she follows cheer-

fully because she is allowed to feed with the horses out of the same trough, three times a day. In the front end of the great wagon the old-time family churn has been placed so that when the cow is milked three times a day the milk is strained and poured into the churn. When the wagon stops for noon the faithful housewife empties her churn of fresh butter and milk for the family dinner. The jolting of the wagon has done the churning as they journeyed along the way. Finally they reach their destination and work begins. Much is to be done. There is bread to win from the soil, clothing to provide, schools to arrange for and the Church to establish and not one of these things is neglected. Dr. Bernheim tells in his admirable history of the toil and sacrifices and grand achievements. The soil is fertile and responsive to the touch and times grow prosperous. But it can not always remain thus. The spirit of migration is again in the air. Westward ho! is the cry. The old century is merged into the new. Many of the fathers and mothers have been reverently laid to rest; a new generation is carrying on the work the fathers had begun. 1817 is the year of our Lord. Preparations are active. "The Illinois" is the destination. Among those who leave the old North State this year are notably, John Yost, John Miller and Jacob Rendleman. The journey was begun with faith in God. Westward to the Blue Ridge Mountains, over the backbone by the old water mill whose wreck still may be seen near Round Mountain Hotel from the W. N. C. R. R., by way of Ashville and on along the banks of the beautiful French Broad River. It must have been along this road with its inspiring scenery that the poet wrote his lines:

> "High o'er the hills the mountains rise,
> Their summits tower towards the skies,
> But far above them I must dwell
> Or sink beneath the flames of hell."

After leaving Ashville and the French Broad River they headed for Louisville, Ky., where they crossed the Ohio River and thence through Indiana and Illinois to Montgomery county where many of them made their home. Others desiring a warmer climate set their faces southward and after one hundred and fifty miles reached Union county. We hear men wonder

why the early settlers did not stop on the broad and beautiful prairies instead of locating among the hills where the land must be cleared before it could be planted. The reason is a simple one. On the plains there was no water, no wood for fuel and no timber with which to build the home. Hillsboro, their county seat, and Litchfield were in the midst of great forests. Union county had as fine woodland as was ever seen. Here they found a place of water and timber. Wild animals were abundant with which they supplied their households with choice meat. Pea vines were abundant for the cattle and horses. On the arrival in Union county an unusual condition was found to exist. The house was already built. The settlers who fled from the terrors of the earthquake in 1811 had erected houses and cleared ten or fifteen acres of land about the house. This was a great boon to the people weary from their long journey. In the early days they did not raise much grain. There was no market. They needed only enough for home consumption and this did not require much. Among these brave men and women were John Yost, John Miller and Jacob Rendleman. The next year among others came Adam Cruse. The next year, 1819, came Jacob Hileman and friends. John Fink and family came in 1820. Jacob Rendleman located two miles north of Jonesboro and was one of the charter members of the Union Church on the north side. Alexander Trees located on the east two miles and was also identified with the Union Church. Chiefly, however, they settled south of Jonesboro. By the end of the second year there was a goodly company of Lutherans and Reformeds in the community. There were the Cruse family, the Eddleman, the Barnhart, Hileman, Dillow, Rendleman, Trees, Hartline, Ellis, Goodman, Miller, Yost, Mowery, Pool, Rinehart, Hilig, Peter Sifferd and family and others whom we can not recall now. It was a fine hill country they selected for themselves and their children. It was ten miles west of the Mississippi and twenty miles to the Ohio on the east, and thirty miles south to the point where the one empties into the other Three hundred and thirty miles to Lake Michigan on the north. There sprang up the little village of Jonesboro destined to be the county seat for at least a century. Anna was not then in existence. These Lutheran people had the privilege of the gospel ministrations only as some Lutheran clergymen chanced to pass that way. When such op-

portunity was afforded a messenger was sent from house to house to notify the people who assembled at a private house for public worship. Most frequently these services were held at the home of John Miller near whose residence St. John's Church was afterward built.

A congregation was organized in 1819 and from that date to 1822 one Reverend Wineburg of Missouri preached for them occasionally.

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH.

St. John's Church was therefore organized in 1819 and three years later a log church[1] was erected by these people for the use of the Lutheran and Reformed congregations, both of whom worshipped in the German language. There is no church record before the arrival of Rev. John C. A. Schoenberg in 1827. In 1823 one Rev. Murrets also came over from Missouri into this settlement and served them in the double capacity of pastor and school teacher for one year. For some months again they were without religious ministrations. I find in Dr. Bernheim's history of Lutherans in the Carolinas that a petition signed by forty-three persons was sent from this community to the N. C. Synod for a pastor who would be able to preach in both the English and German languages and to establish schools, and labor for the general welfare of the Church. And this petition further declared that if such provision could not be made the result would be very injurious to them and to their children. The Synod requested the Rev. William Jenkins to visit these brethren in Illinois and a letter was at the same time sent to the Rev. Samuel Schmucker asking him, if possible, to send a missionary to Illinois. In 1827, two years later, a second similar petition was sent to the same synod giving a mournful description of their spiritual destitution requesting that the Rev. Jacob Scherer visit them and if that were not possible that synod would send some other man with the arrangement to give some aid to his support. It appears that Rev. Scherer could not then visit them and the Rev. John C. A. Schoenberg was requested to visit and if possible, locate among them as their pastor. The Rev. Schoenberg accepted the appointment and arrived in 1827. This was the first Lutheran missionary sent to the great state of Illinois.

1 The log church now stands on the north end of the town of Springville and serves as a barn. The timber is still in a good state of preservation. It is the property of Rev. D. C. Hurst.

After about two years' work here, his health failed and he was forced to resign in 1829.

In the autumn of 1831 Rev. Daniel Scherer, then pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Cabarras county, N. C., moved by the missionary spirit, came to Illinois to take up the work laid down by Rev. Schoenberg. His residence, however, was not in Union county but in Hillsboro, Illinois, one hundred and fifty miles further north, where an almost equal number of these same people had settled about the same time.

In 1833, two years after his arrival, we find him writing an encouraging letter to the Synod of North Carolina informing them of the pleasing fact that he had organized a second Lutheran Church, in the town of Hillsboro, Illinois. This second church was organized with thirty-five communicant members. He was greatly beloved by the people of Union county, to whom he came to minister as their pastor once every three months. The journey from Hillsboro to Jonesboro on horseback over hills and valleys, across wide stretches of prairie, with numerous bridgeless rivers would, in this age of travel, be considered a perilous task, but with his energy and consecration it was a pleasant one. Professor Haverstick of Pennsylvania, speaks in the highest terms of his energy, saying, "He often rode one hundred and fifty miles on horseback to minister to the spiritual wants in the different settlements in Illinois." He served as pastor for three years.

The Rev. Posthauer succeeded him as pastor in Union county but remained for a short time only. After this the Rev. Edward Olmstead came in 1837 and served as pastor of St. John's Church, preaching once a month for eight years. And now for three years, from 1846 to 1849, they had only occasional preaching.

In March, 1849, the Rev. John Krack of Louisville, Ky., took charge and served until 1854, preaching once each month. During his pastorate a parsonage was erected in Jonesboro, the lot being deeded by Willis Willard. And in the year 1853 the Mt. Pisgah Ev. Lutheran Church was erected in the same county six miles south of St. Johns and two and one-half miles from Dongola. October the first, 1854, Rev. Daniel Jenkins, brother of the late Rev. Wm. Jenkins of Shelby, Tenn., was called to the charge. Rev. Jenkins was a man of great zeal

and fervent piety and during his seven years service as pastor, these churches in Union county reached their highest prosperity. Unity of sentiment prevailed on every hand, but before he had completed the seventh year of his delightful and prosperous ministry among these people the Master called him to the enjoyment of the Church triumphant. On June 21st, 1861, the people were called upon to lay away the body of the devoted pastor in the silent chambers of the grave. During his successful labors the old log meeting house gave place to a modern frame church 35 by 48 feet which was erected in the beautiful grove within two hundred feet of the site of the old church. The builder was Jacob Barnhart, son of Christopher Barnhart. The house was erected in 1855-1856.

In the fall of 1856 Dr. Harkey organized the Synod of the Southwest in this new church building before it was quite completed. The officers of the Church at this time were, Rev. Daniel Jenkins, Pastor; Elders, Jacob Dillow and Jacob Barnhart; Deacons, Jacob Miller and Samuel Hileman. According to the Constitution, drafted by the Rev. John C. A. Schoenberg, and adopted by the congregation Jan. 5th, 1828, one of the duties devolving upon the elders of the church was "to visit the school frequently, and render the pastor any aid that might be necessary in educating the children of the congregation." This record shows that there were 50 infant baptisms during the years 1827 and 1828. The next records were made in English, but very indifferently kept. It is interesting to note all along the line of the meagre records the anxiety on the part of the parents for the spiritual and intellectual development of the rising generation.

August, 1861, the church having been made vacant by the decease of Pastor Daniel Jenkins, the young Rev. H. M. Brewer of Hagerstown, Md., was called to the pastorate, He served the churches from Aug. 1861, to Mar. 1863. The church being vacant again, the Rev. Isaac Albright, who united with the Lutheran Synod from the M. E. Conference, was elected pastor. At the close of the first year he resigned, and united with the M. E. Church South. Being a man of limited ability in the pulpit, and of strong political inclinations, his union with the Lutheran Church in the troubulous war times was, to put it mildly, not helpful.

Great advances were now made over those early days when the pastor could be at St. John's only every twelve weeks. In 1862 the pastor preached twice each month, once in the morning and once in the afternoon.

There was an interregnum from 1863 to 1865 when the Rev. David Sprecher of Iowa was called. The charge at this time consisted of St. John's, Union, three miles north of Jonesboro, Mt. Pisgah, six miles south of St. John's on the Illinois Central Railroad, Misenheimer's School House, and one or two other points. The prevalent opinion was that the field was now too large to be served efficiently by one pastor, hence in July 1866, a meeting of the entire charge was called. This conference was held in St. John's Church and resulted in the formation of the two pastorates known as the "Jonesboro" and the "Dongola" pastorates. The former was composed of St. John's, Union and Jonesboro, the last named worshipped in the M. E. Church, but, on account of the decline of the town, did not build a church. The Dongola pastorate included Mt. Pisgah and other points. In the formation of the two pastorates Rev. David Sprecher was elected to serve the Dongola charge, but supplied the Jonesboro pastorate with occasional preaching until 1868.

In 1866, the Rev. H. M. Brewer, while engaged in teaching school in Dongola organized a congregation of five members. The same year they undertook to build a church. Fearing that they would not be able to do it alone they invited the Methodists and Presbyterians to take each a third interest. Some money was raised but each held back for the other until the work ceased—the building not yet half done, and the contractor threatened to sell it in order to pay himself. The Rev. Sprecher then took hold of the matter and raised enough money to finish the building. In 1867 an acre of ground was secured and a good parsonage, with an L, 24 by 32 feet, was erected upon it.

March 1868, the Rev. John R. Shoffner of Middle Tennessee, was elected pastor of the Jonesboro charge with residence in Anna. The congregations had by this time become entirely English, and pastor Shoffner prepared an English constitution for the government of the church. This constitution was adopted June 10, 1869. An English roll of communicants was made at the same time. This gave the first accurate statement of the strength of the chuch since 1843. Pastor Shoffner served the

charge for three years and three months. During his term of service 50 members were added to the entire charge.

Mt. Moriah. He not only took up his residence in the new and growing town of Anna, situated on the Illinois Central Railroad, one mile and a quarter from the center of Jonesboro, but organized a congregation, Feb. 9, 1869, and adopted a constitution on the 19th of the same month. There were 22 charter members. June 1871, he resigned to accept a call to Lionville, Pa.

The Jonesboro pastorate was now vacant from June 1871 to Feb. 4th, 1873, being supplied occasionally, chiefly by Rev. Sprecher. Meanwhile a call was extended to the Rev. J. M. Lingle, Mt. Carmel, Ill., who visited the charge and preached a number of times to the pleasure and edification of the people. Everything seemed favorable but for some cause, unknown to the congregations, he did not accept the call.

At the request of the Church the Secretary invited the Rev. L. C. Groseclose, pastor of St. John's, Cabarras county, N. C., to visit them with a view to becoming their pastor. He reached them Feb. 4th, 1873, and preached for them as supply until Mar. 23rd, at which date he was elected pastor. He began his labors, as pastor, April 1st, 1873, but chills and fever so wasted his physical strength that he was only able to fill one appointment in Anna during the fifteen months of his pastorate. He decided to accept a call to Irving, Montgomery county, Ill., closing his labors at St. John's July 1st, 1874. The churches of the Irving charge had grown out of the settlements of these same North Carolinians in and about Hillsboro, Ill. These were the days before railroads, and coal and lumber on the prairies, hence it was necessary for the early settlers to find timber for building and fuel. The wagon trail from North Carolina crossed the mountains via Ashville, N. C., the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky., across Indiana and Illinois to the timber land of Montgomery county where many of them settled and where their descendants in great numbers may still be found. Those who desired a less rigorous climate turned their faces to the south and journeyed until they came to Union county, Ill. Here the climate was mild and the soil fertile and the timber all that could be desired. Thus related, it is natural that these two settlements should have a lively interest in each other. And as failure of crops was rare in this southland it became common for the people of the north

settlement to "go down to Egypt to buy corn." And to this day southern Illinois is called "Egypt." These are descendants of those sturdy Lutheran and Reformed families who journeyed from Pennsylvania to North Carolina by wagon about the year 1755. There are no people more loyal to their Church and considerate of their pastor than these. One great source of grief to many of the parents was the lack of catechetical instruction of the young. For this there were two chief causes the want of a pastor much of the time and the neglect of this part of the pas tor's work in that period of church history. Then too, there was a lack of doctrinal preaching. There was much dogma but not much doctrine.

From the resignation of the Rev. L. C. Groseclose, July 1, 1874, to the 8th of May, 1875, the charge was vacant. The churches suffered more or less through the troublous war times, out of which grew distraction and discouragement. There was also reaction in the high pressure revival methods prevalent during some previous years. The Rev. L. C. Groseclose who had changed his methods of church work opposed the prevalent revival methods and introduced the opposite style of preaching. Hence the condition of things was quite unsettled. In the meantime it was difficult to hold a congregational meeting. If the health of the pastor had permitted him to preach more frequently he would soon have set things in order. But as it was things must wait.

The new beginning occurred in April 1875 when after three failures to hold a council meeting Joe Trees, M. N. Heilig and A. Eddleman met in Anna and decided, on the recommendation of John T. Linn and the Rev. Groseclose, to extend a call to C. W. Sifferd then in the Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pa., with the agreement that they would assume all responsibility for the pastor's salary, and in the meantime to enlist the interest of the congregation again and to accept for the pastor whatever the people might wish to give. The pastor "to be" preached his first sermon in St. John's Church at 11 a. m., May the 9th, 1875. The pastor and bride were most kindly received. Possibly the fact that the pastor's father had been the family physician of a number of them before they went to Illinois had much to do with it. The three brethren, who still live to enjoy the fruit of their

faith and devotion to the Church were not allowed to pay more than their share of the salary.

Services were held at St. John's every two weeks, at Union Church once a month and in the new town of Anna once a month in the morning and once in the evening. The use of the Reformed Church was tendered and accepted by the Lutherans. We had then eighteen members in and about the town. Lieutenant Governor John Dougherty was one of our members. His home has since been purchased for the Lutheran parsonage. At the end of five months we called for an election of a pastor and received every vote in the three congregations This was an encouraging start. On the last Saturday in Jan. 1876, we called the council together to consider the purchase of a parsonage, having then a very generous offer from Thomas Perine. The council met in the residence of J. Trees and after due consideration instructed the pastor to take posession of the house on the following Monday. The necessary money was soon raised and paid cash and the people were happy. A few months previous it was decided to purchase an organ for St. John's Church. This also was paid cash. In 1878 a lot was purchased for the erection of a church in Anna. The pastor with others selected a lot on West Main street on which the present church stands. But being so few in number and with so little money among us and also because it was feared by some that the traffic on Main street would disturb the services, it was determined to build on the next street to Main. It was never a matter of regret. The congregation determined to "arise and build" and in January a plan was adopted and the pastor secured all the framing material through the country people who cut the logs, hauled them to the mill, had them sawed, paid the sawing and delivered the lumber on the church lot free of cost to the congregation. The stone and sand for the foundation and the sand for the plastering were furnished in the same way. On the first day of May 1879, the pastor and the Rev. A. L. Yount, now Dr. Yount of Greensburg, Pa., formally laid the corner stone in the presence of a nice audience. On the 11th of August the church was dedicated free of debt. R. Johnson, N. G. Miller and Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Lentz united with the church on dedication day. Rev. D. M. Henkel, pastor at Nokomis, Ill., preached the dedication sermon. The dedication service was rather elaborate. A printed service was

prepared by the pastor modeled after the one used at the dedication of the Holy Communion, Dr. Seiss, pastor, Philadelphia, Pa. Revs. D. M. Henkel, A. L. Yount, and Wm. Pruitt assisted in the service. While Rev. Henkel preached the dedication sermon in the Lutheran Church Rev. A. L. Yount, pastor of Murphysboro, First Church, preached to an overflow congregation in the Presbyterian Church. The cost of the church was $1600. Though it was estimated to be worth $2500 to $3000 if built in the ordinary way. The entire county of Lutheranism rejoiced that day. It was a matter of special interest since Anna was looked to as the best town in the county, and a most desirable place for the people to come to spend the evening of their lives. The expectation has been realized in every way. Anna is the center of influence in the county, perhaps in the Synod.

Union Church was located two miles north of Anna. It was always a popular burial place. No careful record of its earlier history is found until J. R. Schoffner appears as its pastor. He was a methodical man and nothing was too much trouble if it ought to be done. The old log church was erected about five years after St. John's. This served its purpose until 1847 when the new church was erected. The building committee was composed of D. Harris Rendleman, Peter Sifferd, David Miller, Jr., and Samuel Dillow. The church was for the use of the Lutheran and Reformed congregations. Josiah Roberts took the contract for the carpenter work at $139 of which $43.75 was to be paid in cash when the work was completed. Many years afterwards it was found that the deed was vested in the Reformed Church alone. The Reformed Church died out and the Congregational Church took possession of the property, tore down the church buildings and hauled it eleven miles south to Mill Creek for Congregational use. Recently a committee was appointed and a new church building has been erected in its place. This was done chiefly on account of the cemetery, since the people could attend church either in Anna or Cobden.

The German Lutheran Church of the county is located two miles south of Jonesboro. About 1850 a number of Germans from Austria settled in this portion of the county and in 1854 began the erection of the German Evangelical Lutheran Church in connection with the German Iowa Synod. Joseph Meier, Sr., Joseph Kollenner, and Henry Stirewalt of N. C., together with

others, composed the congregation. The church was finished and dedicated in the year 1860. It has a vestry and gallery and is attractive and churchly. There is also a school house.

A second church was built in Jonesboro, but it did not long remain in connection with the Synod. It was the child of dissension and soon went into the Albright Conference. These Austrian Lutherans were most estimable people, both as to Church and State. They brought money with them from the fatherland and were a model community. It was in connection with this church and its supply that we were invited to preach an English sermon, the first, in the Immanuel Ev. Lutheran Church in the city of Cairo which resulted in its coming into the Southern Illinois Synod

Tulsa, Oklahoma.

ARTICLE VIII.

FAITHFUL CATECHISATION AND ITS RESULTS

BY W. C. SEIDEL, D.D.

Are the Protestant Churches satisfied with their various methods of reaching the masses? Do the dominant present methods meet their expectations? Do the results justify the methods employed? Do those methods accord with the practice of the apostles and the early Church Fathers? A negative answer must be given to all these inquiries. As a temporary agency, any of the methods may be employed with some success, but they do not meet the divine demand, nor even satisfy human expectation.

1. The various schemes employed, and changes made in those methods by eminent pastors and evangelists, are the best proof of their unsatisfactory character. The great "Burning Problem" is: How can we best reach and evangelize the unchurched masses? How can we best build up, and establish, in Christian life and doctrine, those who are gathered? These are not sentimental questions of an enthusiast. They are the deep, pressing problems confronting the Church.

2. I do not flatter myself that I shall give a satisfactory answer to all men, but I am persuaded that the best answer to the perplexing problem is, Return to the divine method of imparting truth to the human mind, namely, wise, faithful, scientific instruction of the people and the youth in the great doctrines of life and salvation, as taught in the Word of God, by careful and diligent catechisation.

3. It is significant to learn from the sacred Scriptures with what zeal God urges the instruction of men, women and children in righteousness. And yet, that is precisely according to the fitness of things, when we contemplate God's purpose concerning man and man's relation to Him according to that Word. Having created us with the intellectual faculties predominant, God evidently purposes that through them moral and spiritual truth must be apprehended. It is very clear, therefore, that in

the full development of these lies the way to our truest happiness here and hereafter.

4. It is in the proper training and exercise of his intellectual, moral and spiritual faculties that man attains to, and answers, the highest end of his creation. The physical powers must always be held in subjection to the spiritual, if we are to reach our highest destiny: The glory of God in the salvation of our souls, and the moral and spiritual well-being of our fellowmen. Christ puts that fact in the clearest light when He declares: "Here, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength:.. and thy neighbor as thy self:....on these two Commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Mark 12:29-32.

5. Here too we see a new reason why Christ should receive sinners to Himself while here on earth. He saw them ignorant of His Father's compassion, saw them depraved, degraded, guilty, outcast and oppressed. He beheld the people, as sheep having no shepherd, afflicted, depressed and groaning under the yoke of sin. He knew they were strangers to their own better, nobler natures, strangers to the covenant of promise, strangers to their Heavenly Father's yearning for their return to Him, ignorant of Christ's compassion for them and His desire to save. What an amazing announcement when He says, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and you shall find rest for your souls." Matt. 11:28-30. Now Christ reveals to them how the Father had taught by the prophets that, "They shall be taught of God. Every one therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me." John 6:45.

6. But what a sad reflection on the teachers that the mass of men had not been so taught. And what a painful commentary on human perversity, that many of those whom Christ then taught of His Father's good pleasure, would not hear, much less give heed, believe and be saved.

I. The written word to guide man to life and to his God.

1. "It is written in the prophets." Here Christ appeals directly to the prophetic Scriptures for the fact that God would have all men taught concerning Himself, their desolate condi-

tion because of sin and Christ's work of deliverance of man from self-imposed ruin. By the Prophet Isaiah, God taught Israel, "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established." Is. 54:13.

2. Solomon had taught before, "Train up a child in the way in which he should go: and when he is old he will not depart from it." The first seven chapters of Proverbs are full of instructions to young and old, as to how to live, in order to meet their destiny. In the 78th Psalm Asaph appeals, "Give ear, O my people, to my law; incline your ears to the words of my mouth." Then he indicates how their fathers were commanded to keep the laws of God, and teach them to their children.

3. Moses, by the authority of God, charges his people, "Only take heed to thy self and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things, which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life: but teach them to thy sons and thy sons' sons....that they may learn to fear Me all the days that they shall live upon the earth," &c. Deu. 4:8-10. In Deu. 6:6-13 the systematic, catechetical official duty is impressed upon all Israel. What could be more sublimely impressive than God's urgent, anxious demand that humanity should be instructed in all that He has revealed. The above Scriptures do not only indicate that all should be taught of God, but that the knowledge should be imparted, systematically, officially, persistently and catechetically, that is, by repetition through questions and answers.

4. The obligation here laid upon the Church and her teachers is as broad as the plan of redemption and is as universal as the race. There are some men who regard themselves neglected of God, but that is a delusion. Men often do neglect their fellows, but God never overlooks, or neglects none of His creatures, no, not even a sparrow. His demand is specific, "They shall be taught of God." Christ, in His charge to the disciples, commands them, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always," &c. You will observe, that in both of these Scriptures, as in many others, more is required than simple preaching. They require that all shall

be carefully, systematically and thoroughly instructed in certain specific facts, for a certain specific purpose: to hear and submit, —believe and be baptized,—to observe and do all things whatsoever I have commanded.

5. "Didaktoi," in John 6:45, gives us specific direction. It is not the word indicating preaching, or heralding. It means: To impart, by teaching, instructing, informing—sharing our knowledge with others to inculcate, show, tell, make known. So also, "Matheteuo" means: To teach, make converts, or disciples. Taken together with the facts to be taught, it means: The careful, systematic instruction in the doctrines of God. His character, attributes and purposes with, and work for, and in us—our duty to Him as our Creator, Preserver, Benefactor—our relation to Christ as our Savior and to the Holy Ghost as our Enlightener, Regenerator, Comforter and Sanctifier. It charges us, to teach men, on the authority of God, in their duty to each other, their care for each other, that they also might know the way of righteousness, and be preserved to walk therein.

6. Now then all must be instructed in the essentials of life. "Every one, therefore, that hath heard and learned of the Father commeth unto Me."

a. This instruction, however, must not simply be intellectual. The object is to teach men to comprehend, regard seriously and obey. The object is to bring the pupil into submission to, and harmony with God in order that he may be adopted into holy covenant, and renewed by the Holy Ghost; or, where that divine work has already been accomplished the person needs to be further instructed in the exalted privileges of a child of God, and in his mission as a soul-winner.

b. The Church cannot redeem and save. God must do that, and Christ came for that purpose. But, the Church through her ministry and other agencies, must gather the parents and their children and carefully and systematically instruct them in God's Word. She must lead them to Christ, who by His sacrificial suffering and death atoned for their sin. She must teach such to yield to the Spirit's work of regeneration and sanction, and assure the inquirer that when he is so removed he becomes an heir of God and joint heir with Christ.

7. In view of these fundamental facts, think of the folly and ignorance of the men who charge us with "Teaching Religion."

a. We cheerfully acknowledge the charge. For, I regard it the truest, purest and holiest work of our Church that she instructs her adults, and youth alike, in the fundamental doctrines of our holy religion.

b. The charge, however, implies that we disparage experimental, practical, or heart religion, i. e., spirituality. In answer, I have simply to say: There is no Church on earth which can present a holier, purer, truer piety than the historic Lutheran Church. Yes, we do teach religion in obedience to our God who commands us in the Old Testament, and to the Master, who in His last command declares, Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, and having baptized those who gave heed, to instruct them to observe all things whatsoever I command, who said to the believing Jews, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and truth shall make you free." John 8:31, 32.

c. The supreme purpose of all religious teaching must be: To bring the sinner to Christ for pardon and salvation. The chief purpose in the administration of the sacraments is to seal to the believing soul the blessings of redemption.

The divine economy contemplates the instruction of every man, woman and child, in the knowledge of God and their obligations to Him as their Creator, Redeemer and Benefactor. It should be the supreme purpose of the Church, and it must be our chief work as ministers of the Lutheran Church to bring every child and youth to a saving knowledge of Christ by committing them to God, in holy covenant by baptism, then diligently instruct them in the fundamental truths of that covenant.

II. The perplexing question with every thinking pastor is: How can this all-important work be best performed?

My conviction after long experience and practice, and close observation is:

1. That children from the age of five to twelve years are best reached and instructed by regular catechisation, that is by questions and answers and explanation of the lesson by the pastor, or by some other person qualified and appointed. That work must, however, be carried through a period of at least three years of thorough and systematic instruction. The wretched practice of instructing a class two or three months and then confirm them brings into the Church an unwieldly mass of worldly

people instead of godly, pious, regenerated Christians. All this is avoided by the judicious, godly pastor. He gives a short time to the questions and answers; then explaining the language he supports the whole work by appropriate Scripture passages. He requires the class to commit certain portions of God's Word, and so treasure up in their minds a rich fund of blessed truths. Such a process makes the work permanent. The faithful pastor will in this way secure a devotion to the truth taught, an affection for the doctrines of the Church and God's Word, and a spiritual discernment of the deeper things of life which will abide through all the changing scenes of life. Yes,more, he will build up a congregation of truly spiritual people who will become co-workers with him.

2. The young people above the age of twelve are best reached and instructed by the lecture system. There is something fascinating about this method that draws the young people. Their minds are stimulated thereby to think, read and inquire into the truths taught. Their minds become stored with useful knowledge. They are led to see a sure foundation for faith. Their spiritual nature becomes aroused and they lay active hold upon the love and fear of God as revealed in Christ Jesus by the Holy Ghost.

a. This method both can, and should be carried beyond confirmation. At confirmation the catechumen only begins to realize the benefit of such instruction in the valuable information it imparts and the qualification for life's mission which it gives.

b. This method enjoys the especial advantage of drawing the adult members of the church and also attracts outsiders who prize such instruction and who are very often thereby led to a definite Christian life.

c. This method has the valuable advantage of encouraging the asking of questions. This enables the pastor to learn what is in the mind of his hearers and to see the effect of his work.

d. Such a series of lectures should always include close Bible study. The Scriptures should be made supreme, the catechism always secondary. The illustrations given should be drawn from Scripture characters rather than from secular life. Two cautions are needful. Never allow loose aimless discussion. The lectures or addresses should not be formal, or aim to display

learning or scholarship. The language must be plain, the words employed as nearly as possible those in use in every-day life.

e. But it dare not be merely cheap, talk, talk, talk. The instruction must deal with the fundamental facts of God's Word and sacraments—Christ's redeeming work, the call, renewal and sanctification of the Holy Ghost.

3. It is claimed by many that the Sunday School does the work now which the pastors did in earlier years, and therefore supplants the pastoral instruction. Supplanted, unfortunately, it has in many cases, but the work it has not done, nor can do, because the Sunday School teachers are not qualified, as a rule.

a. The Sunday School has done a blessed work in the past, and has a mission now, but it cannot do that work which every true pastor knows is the most important of all his labors. Besides, every parent covenants to have his child so instructed, when he presents him to God in baptism; and every pastor assumes the sacred vow in his ordination to instruct and indoctrinate the children and youth.

b. From the nature of the case the children do not get that spiritual nourishment which the soul craves and needs: the knowledge of God as Father of Jesus the Christ, as Redeemer and Savior, and the Holy Ghost as Sanctifier, the meaning and purpose of the sacraments, and the doctrines of repentance, regeneration, justification and eternal life.

c. The proper unfolding of these doctrines, so that the young can comprehend them, requires the best skill of the pastor. Dr. J. A. Brown, of sainted memory, charged our class in theology, never to enter the class room without special preparation to impart the lesson. The Sunday School teachers, as a rule, do not understand these essential doctrines of the Church and how can they teach them to their children?

4. In preaching the Word to a mixed congregation, the pastor cannot deal with the great fundamental doctrines systematically, because there his aim must be to arouse the attention, move the will to receive and accept the facts he brings. Then he must edify, comfort or rebuke because of unbelief and open sin. The nature of a mixed audience precludes systematic instruction. If, therefore, the children, youth and new converts, are not established in God's Word, and the doctrine of the Church by catechisation, they are left helpless victims to the

deceiver. In the lecture system of catechisation the most abstract truths may be made clear, because the hearer has the opportunity to ask questions and so secure further information. Besides, he has his catechism, well explained, to guide him in after life. The minister must, of course, prove himself equal to such work. He must be master of the situation. Only thus will he be able to secure a ready reception of the truths he teaches.

Dr. W. G. T. Shedd, in his *Homiletic Theology* writes: "The effect of catechisation upon the clergyman is, to render his views in theology decided. Catechisation is, in reality, the intensely practical study of theology, in his endeavor to transmit the dogmas of religion into the thoughts and feelings of the youthful mind. While imparting this catechetical instruction, therefore, the clergyman becomes more profoundly certain of the truths of Christianity. He grows more and more positive in his views and affirmations, and gradually acquires that Scriptural boldness which causes him to speak with authority."

Dr. Henry Ziegler writes, in his *Catechetics*: "The minister in the Lutheran Church, who either from incapacity for the work, or disinclination to it, or because of outside clamor, or abuse, neglects catechetical instruction, is unworthy of the name he bears. He is in the wrong fold, he lives in the wrong element."

Some time ago, an elder, in the M. E. Church South, at Ausell, Ga., delivered a stirring address on "The Absolute necessity f our pastors instructing our children in the doctrines of relion." When he had finished, he asked me, "What do you think f my position?" I said to him: "Why, I was amused all the ime you were talking to see that your eyes had actually been pened to perceive this necessity, and at the same time recalled ow some of your earlier preachers abused and berated us, for aching the children religion, demanding that they should be ft alone to choose for themeslves." He said: "Well, we've arned better, and I see no other way to save the children and tablish the new converts in truth."

III. Some may ask, why plead so strenuously for this systeatic instruction of the youth? I reply:

1. Because, as I have shown, the Sunday School instruction insufficient, and the children in many instances do not attend

preaching, and when they do, the sermon is usually of such a general character as not to afford the indispensable and spiritual training. But systematic catechization furnishes the youth, and new convert, the best possible knowledge obtainable. It will impart to them the truest safeguard in life. It will lay the foundation for the attainment of other knowledge, completing their intellectual training, and so feed both mind and heart with the bread of life.

2. This kind of instruction is especially necessary in this country where the public schools, the state colleges, and universities are purely secular. Indeed within the last twenty-five years the teaching of the last has become largely rationalistic. Just now, however, there is a tremendous protest against the rationalism and infidelity taught in some of the universities. Dr. Samuel Wagenhalls recently delivered a masterly protest in an address, at the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, against this menace of our free school system. (Bible Student Teacher, Vol. 14:82).

3. Because the religious nature of the youth, by such instruction is properly developed, and fed with the Word of Life, and their spiritual nature and destiny are safeguarded. So finished and developed, they are enabled to build their future labor, faith and hope on the only sure foundation. When governed by sound Christian principles, implanted in their youth, they become more steadfast and useful in whatsoever position of trust they are placed in life. Firmness with true piety is a precious treasure, a royal diadem, a crown of glory. The world and the Church need more such men and women. Godliness is profitable to all having the promise of the life which now is and that which is to come. Through such early careful training of her youth the Church itself becomes more efficient in her God-appointed work of leading wayward, unbelieving souls back to their God, in penitence and faith in Jesus Christ.

4. Because the Word of God demands it, and assures the recipient of such instruction, of the largest blessing, even length of days and peace, wisdom, knowledge and understanding and righteousness. "Let not mercy and truth forsake thee: bind them about thy neck; write them upon the table of thine heart: So shalt thou have favor and good understanding in the sight of God and man." "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life." Prov. 2: 8, 9; 3:1-4; 4:20-23.

5. The Lord demands this instruction. "Feed My sheep, feed My lambs" is the specified command to Peter. To Satan He says: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every Word of God." To the asesmbled people He says: "And they shall all be taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto Me." "This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." Solomon assures us that if we train up a child in the way he should go, when he is old he will not depart from it. Prov. 22:6.

To the elders St. Paul says, in his farewell address: "Take heed to yourselves and to the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood....and now I commend you to God, and the Word of His grace, which is able to build you up and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." Acts 20:28,32.

6. The nature of the youth demands such instruction. The religious nature of young people and children is an infinitely more important factor than the body. This latter will decay and return to earth, but the soul will live forever. The skill of the eye, or hand, or feet will pass away. The beauty and symmetry will vanish, but the mind and soul endure forever and carry with them the knowledge here acquired into eternity, whether that knowledge and culture be good or evil. Character is fixed here and eternal life and salvation must be acquired now if they are to be attained at all. When these are neglected, or lost, here, they are lost forever.

7. Reason demands such a course of instruction. Since man is endowed with a religious nature, since childhood and youth are emphatically the period in life, in which the mind and heart are most susceptible of religious instruction, and since the will, in youth, is more pliable than in advanced age, sound judgment demands that every proper method and agency be employed for the training of the youth to fit them for their highest destiny. Christ commands: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." "I am the light of the world: he that followeth Me, shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." John 8:12. "Take this child and nurse it for me and I will give thee thy

wages." Obedience to that command of the Princess led to the training of Moses in all the wisdom and knowledge of Egypt. In principle we have a like command from the Master for the training of the children associated with our churches. Under this conviction my practice has been to ask parents outside of the Church for their children, to let me instruct them in Christian doctrine and life.

a. Reason demands that a child should first learn the laws governing his moral nature, his relations to his God, to his parents and his fellowmen, his origin and destiny, and the obligations laid on him by his Creator.

b. The truth is, Christian character matures and moves according to the divine plan only, when the mind is leavened with evangelical truth, and the life of such a one develops symmetrically because the fundamental doctrines of Christianity have been studied in their orderly connection.

c. Enlightened reason urges parents to secure the best possible secular education by the best teachers, on the most approved system of mental training and culture, in order to qualify them for their life-work. Parents will sacrifice every comfort and will spend money lavishly to secure this laudable end.

d. Is it not a lamentable fact that these Christian parents, who send their sons and daughters to the most approved schools for secular culture, at any expense, yet leave the religious training and culture without any provision?

e. Is it any wonder that the life, of so many, otherwise noble young people end in moral sin? Is it not a miracle that many, so neglected, are saved at all? Surely, it is the mystery of the grace of God that keeps such from the power of the enemy.

f. Brethren, in the ministry, I ask you: Shall this neglect continue? Can any minister in the Church stand by and behold this devastation of the noblest of God's handiwork, without throwing himself into the breach and by the help of God stay the awful desolation? Yes! many have done so and have been gloriously rewarded. Many are now zealously training the young of their flock, that they may escape such a calamity. But, there are too many who not only neglect the work but justify themselves with all sorts of vain arguments.

IV. Shall the Church continue as now, or, will the whole Church arise to her blessed opportunity?

There are times and seasons in the history of every enterprise which prove the dividing line between success and failure, just as the occasion is used or neglected by those concerned.

1. Such a time came to Israel, at the Passover and at the Red Sea. They obeyed God and Moses and were saved.

2. Such was Esther's opportunity, and she saved her people.

3. Such a time came to Martin Luther at Worms. He stood firm for the truth and the Lord gave him glorious victory.

4. Such a time came to our army at Gettysburg, and the wisdom, firmness and fidelity of a few generals and their faithful men saved the Union.

5. Such a time, I believe has come, to the Lutheran Church in America, in relation to her historically approved and divinely blessed catechetical system.

6. The success of any Church depends on faithful preaching of "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints," the catechisation of her children and an orderly worship of God. Here rests the whole matter of the future of our Church. If she is faithful to this trust she will live. Any one who has known the older Germanic, or Scandinavian people, has seen how firmly those people are grounded in the truth of God's Word. Just so with the Scotch and Welsh Presbyterians and Episcopalians. How well they are established in Christian doctrine, and how they love God with a devotion that is enduring. How came those people to that knowledge and devotion? Like the older Lutherans, so those, by careful, faithful catechisation.

7. The very fact that most Lutheran people are so well instructed in the doctrines of the holy Scriptures, has made them so attractive to other denominations, as material to draw on. It is a standing confession of their preachers, who say: "Your people become some of our best members and most diligent church workers. They are always well versed in Scripture, and are good contributors." But although much has been done, and our older people as a rule are well informed, it is not so with the younger people in the Church. Therefore this admonition and anxious entreaty.

8. The Lord has imparted to the Lutheran Church through her Reformation conflict, several of the most essential principles in Christendom.

a. She holds and teaches the inspiration and divine authority of the sacred Scriptures.

b. She holds and believes in a deeper conception of the sacraments and their supernatural character.

c. She holds the confessional value and the supernatural character of the Word of God.

d. She has preserved in a measure the necessity of the faithful instruction of her youth in God's Word.

e. She has perpetuated an orderly congregational work of God in her churches.

f. She holds dear as life the redeeming power of the blood of Christ shed for the salvation of men.

g. On this bed-rock of divine truth she builds the doctrine of justification by faith alone through the mercy of God and the blood redemption of Christ.

Will the Lutheran Church prove herself worthy of those great gifts of His grace? Or must He commit them to other worthier hands and hearts?

Sterling, Ill.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

Professor Alvin S. Zerbe, of the Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio, writes in the April number of *The Reformed Church Review* concerning the language of the early Old Testament books. His conclusions, after examining the claims of various archaeologists and linguists are as follows:

1. The foreign correspondence of Israel (in 1400-1600 B. C.) was probably carried on in the Assyrian language and script (exceptionally, perhaps, in the Aramaic language and script).

2. It is not probable that the people as a class understood the Assyrian, or that Hebrew history, legislation, prophecy or literature in general was written in this foreign medium of expression.

3. The hypothesis that the early Old Testament books were composed in the Assyrian language and the cuneiform script is without substantial support.

4. The only conclusion validated by the facts is that the books of the Old Testament, early and late, were written originally in the Hebrew language and script, except a few chapters in Ezra and Daniel (in Aramaic).

In the April *Expositor* (London) Prof. Edward König of Bonn, discussing "The Old Testament Historical Writings" quotes approvingly the dictum of "The well-known Professor Edward Meyer" that the narratives of David are *genuine history* which could not have been written later than the time of Solomon. This attitude of Meyer is commended over against that of Hugo, Winckler and Hermann Schneider, the former of whom speaks contemptuously of the Old Testament historical books, and the latter sees only the presentation of a "philosophy of history." Prof. König finds in the historical writings of the Jews indisputable evidence of the recognition *"of a period before Moses.* So we see that amidst the splendor in which the Mosaic age shone forth as the period of Israel's youth there was not any paling of that light which gleamed on Israel's memory

from an age before the age of Moses." He finds a second ground of faith in the historicity of Israel's records in the fact that "ancient original sources" are quoted, i. e., *The Bock of Wars of Jahveh* (Numb. 21:14) and *The Book of the Upright* (Josh. 10:13; 2 Saml. 1:18). A third ground as to the historical character of the Hebrew narrative is found in the evident "feeling for the preservation of memories." There are many and explicit references to events, places and persons. Allusions to apparently trifling things, such as the pot of manna, the hanging up of Goliath's sword in the sanctuary at Nob, the repeated mention of the cavern-grave at Hebron, unmistakably indicate a true historical background. Moreover, the possibility of records can no longer be denied, for acquaintance with the art of writing in the time of Abraham has been proved beyond doubt.

"Did Paul borrow his Gospel?" is the question asked and answered in the April *Expositor* by Prof. A. E. Garvie. It is alleged by some that he owes much to the Stoics, by others to Plato, and again by others to Roman influence at Tarsus. While the writings of Paul necessarily contain truths common to all thinkers and while he undoubtedly was affected his environment and must have come in contact with heathen philosophy there is no evidence whatever that he borrowed anything from these sources. Even so great an authority as Prof. Ramsey has overstated "the influence of the Gentile environment in Paul's development." Paul's chief external source was necessarily the Old Testament with the interpretation of it given by the Pharisees; but all this is made to harmonize with his own estimate of the person of Christ as realized in his own experience of Christ. "Whatever he may have borrowed of Jewish belief or of Gentile culture, all was brought into captivity to Christ, whose bondslave it was the apostle's boast to confess himself."

"Italian Modernism, Social and Religious," is ably discussed by William Frederick Bade of the Pacific Theological Seminary, in the April *Harvard Theological Review*. The facts are presented for the most part at first hand. "To an outside observer the most significant thing in Italian life to-day is the widening breach between the Roman hierarchy and the proleta-

riat." Southern Italy is in a deplorable state of ignorance and poverty. The percentage of illiterates in Naples is fifty-one and in Sicily it rises to fifty-five. "In the modern struggle of the Italian proletariat for better conditions of living socialism is on the firing-line and its attitude toward the Church is bitterly hostile." The average earnings of the farm laborer is seventy-five dollars a year, out of which he is expected to support his family. The rice-girls of Lombardy and Venetia, standing up to their knees in a swamp all day for thirteen hours received as a rule not over twenty cents a day until they united in a federation several years ago, since which time they receive about twenty-four cents. During the struggle for improved conditions the strikers had to encounter the opposition of "Catholic Leagues" composed mainly of barons, tutors and priests. The attitude of the Vatican has always been repressive. It is true that the Vatican desires the well-being of the masses, but it founds the social redemption of the submerged not upon the demands of justice, but upon the moral obligation of charity. Socialism rejects this idea as unworthy of the laborer. Hence the gulf is widened. The Church stands with the better classes, while socialism, which by virtue of its moral fervor in the pursuit of social betterment should be religious, declares itself not only anticlerical, but antireligious.

"But since socialism is not inherently irreligious, nor Roman Catholicism incurably feudalistic, there was room here for a new movement which could mediate between the two. It started under the direction of an able young priest, Don Romolo Murri, and called itself Christian Democracy." But the Vatican in 1900 forbade the new party to engage in political activity. Its founder has become the leader of the National Democratic League, composed of those who clung to him after the enforced dissolution of his first society. He is the first priest who has been elected by socialists to a seat in the Italian parliament.

Italian modernism in its theological bearings is far less progressive than the English or French. Tyrrell, Blondel and Loisy are chiefly concerned with doctrinal reform by way of readjustment of the Church's teaching to modern thought. Italian modernism has been chiefly identified with social reform. The people of Italy are totally indifferent to matters of religious doctrine. The causes of this, according to Professor Labanca are

"religious indifferentism created by the Roman empire, the abolishment of theological faculties in the universities, the repressive action of the Vatican, the long rule of dogmatism, and the settled habit of Italian men of science and philosophers to omit religion from their thinking." He doubts whether there is enough faith left in Italy for a heresy trial. Nevertheless, Sabatier estimates that among the younger clergy fully half are modernists.

Many thousands of people have left the Church of Rome, but comparatively few have become Protestant. In a population of over 10,000,000 there are only 26,000 Protestants, including practically all foreigners.

Professor Bade concludes his paper with these words, "No one who has watched of late the horizon of Italy's agitated public life can fail to see that ominous clouds are gathering above the Vatican. Will some Benedetto, as in Togazzaro's impressive night-scene, succeed in slipping past the cabal of cardinals to convey warning of the coming storm to one who is in truth a prisoner?"

In the same number of the *Harvard Theological Review,* Mr. Percy Ashley of London, gives a comprehensive sketch of "University Settlements in Great Britain." While it is difficult to define the exact nature of so-called settlement work, in general it is based on the idea that mere professional charity is not helpful but that the true way of assisting the submerged classes is for good and tactful people to live among them, make friends with them and inspire them with high ideals. The warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, Dr. J. Scott Lidgett, writes in one of his reports: "What then are the ideals which give unity to our settlement work? In the first place, the belief that true religion exists to transform all social life, and to direct every human faculty to its true goal and satisfaction. In the next place, the conviction that the supreme ends of Christianity and progress can only be carried out by seeking to rise above the differences of denominations or parties and to establish the wider comradeship of all who deeply care for the higher interests of the people. And lastly, the recognition that the supremacy of the divine law of service is the only remedy for all forms of selfishness, with its inevitable hatred and class warfare."

The relation of this work to Christianity is pronounced to be most intimate. It is being realized that the Church is the true friend of the poor and that the latter are longing for the Spiritual message of the Church as never before.

There are many phases of settlement work reaching both sexes, all ages, and all classes. Recreation, education, public service, including preparation of local officials, councils of public welfare, public health, prevention and relief of destitution, and the "poor man's lawyer" are among the forms of work. In short applied Christianity is the aim in view.

The chief problem for the settlements, after only twenty-five years of experiment, will be that of organization, so that there will be fuller co-operation with one another and the State. "The problem is to become systematic without sacrificing their individuality, without checking spontaneity, and without losing that enthusiasm for the social and moral progress of humanity which, from whatever source fed, has carried them through many doubts and trials to the achievement of so much of lasting good."

The April *Hibbert Journal* has an article from the pen of the late Leo Tolstoy on "Philosophy and Religion" in which he holds that the questions which so puzzle the scientific philosophers were solved centuries ago by religion, and so solved that nothing remains to be solved. "What it comes to at bottom is, that by a long and intricate road of scientific philosophy they [learned men] are brought to the simple position accepted by every Russian peasant—even by those who are illiterate—that *one must live for one's soul.*

In the same number is a ringing article by Professor G. A. Johnston Ross emphasizing the true estimate of the Cross. "Much of the religion of this generation is lacking in vivid apprehension of certain values formerly recognized in the Cross... ..Meanwhile I believe the religion of the Cross is the religion of the future....because it is the only adequate interpretation of all the facts."

The Methodist Review (May-June) has an article on "Why I am not a Premillennialist," by Dr. Daniel Steele of Boston. He gives ten reasons for his rejection of the doctrine of the premillenial advent of Christ.

1. Premillenarism has no adequate Scripture basis. It rests

its claims upon a single passage. Rev. 20:1-8. The book of Revelation is the most figurative and most misunderstood in the whole range of literature. An examination of the passage shows that "there is no hint of the second advent of Christ till the general judgment in verse 11. The angel who imprisons Satan is not Christ, who is never so called. The saints who reign with him are not said to reign with him on the earth.....rather in heaven." "Live does not necessarily imply a bodily resurrection."

2. It rests on the false assumption that the kingdom of Christ will not be established till the King visibly descends. John the Baptist declared "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Peter declared, "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ."

3. It fails to explain the general resurrection so frequently mentioned in the Scriptures. The Bible declares the completeness of the Church at Christ's coming, but the Chiliasts teach that the number of converts made during the millenium will far exceed the present number.

4. It denies the general resurrection as taught in Scripture and has invented two resurrections. Rev. 20:5 is a disputed text at best omitted by the Codex Sinaiticus and other MSS. It must be interpreted metaphorically, if genuine. Otherwise it involves unsurmountable difficulties. The many converts claimed for the millenium, would be without part in the resurrection of the blessed.

5. It destroys one of the chief gospel motives to repentance, namely the expectation of the advent. The Bible warns saint and sinner to look forward to this advent as to a climax. Hence, the multitude, of converts alleged to be gained during the millenium are not affected by one of the chief motives urged in the New Testament.

6. It denies the continuance of the means of grace as proclaimed in the last commission, which commands baptizing and teaching to the end of the world. "Hence the millenium cannot be a Christian era, the institutes of the Gospel having become absolute." In short it repudiates the ordained means of grace —preaching and the sacraments.

7. It implies the cessation of the ministry of the Holy Spirit, for our Lord sent him to be the paraclete during his absence.

Yet it is plain that this is the dispensation of the Spirit who applies the work of Christ, the intercessor in heaven.

8. It is incomprehensible and inconsistent in its teaching. It denies that the kingdom is a growth. It teaches the untrue and pessimistic doctrine that the world is getting worse.

9. It breaks up the teaching of the Word concerning a *day* of judgment and a definite resurrection—distinct events. It breaks these into fragments to string along a thousand years.

10. It introduces a false motive of repentance. It puts in place of the usual motives the idea of a great and glorious earthly kingdom, where Satan has no power, and where there are therefore few foes to face.

In the *American Journal of Theology* (April) Prof. G. D. Walcott of Hamline University discusses "The Logical Aspect of Religious Unity." He believes that the union of all religious denominations is neither possible nor desirable. "If the time should ever come when the entire race would be upon a high plane culturally, when there would no longer be savage or barbarious peoples in the world, but all civilized and that, too, to a high degree, then presumably, there could be a oneness of interpretation of the faith coextensive with the individuals who might in any way profess that faith." But even then union would be only temporary, for new discoveries and opinions would again divide the Church into many denominations.

"Is Jesus a Historical Character?" is discussed by Professor Shirley Jackson Case in the same number of the *Journal*. To the average Christian such a question must seem preposterous; and it is only because of the efforts of negative criticism that it must be answered anew. In seeking a historical basis for the existence of Jesus it must be confessed that the evidence for it in non-Christian writings is very slender indeed. "All our information about Jesus must be derived from the words of his friends.....While there seems to be abundant evidence that Christianity was in existence by the end of the first century, there certainly is no contemporary account of its beginnings, much less such an account of the life of its alleged founder. In its earliest documents, the epistles of Paul, Jesus appears as the heavenly exalted Lord whom believers reverence almost as God

Himself. Consequently it has been claimed that the New Testament representation of Jesus is inconceivable as starting from recollections of a real person.....The situation is explicable only on the assumption that Jesus was primarily an anthropomorphized god, not a deified man."

Such are the presuppositions of speculative criticism, which it is thought necessary to answer. To begin with the genuineness of the Pauline epistles must be maintained. For this there is indubitable evidence. Then an examination of various passages will show clearly that Paul regarded Jesus as "born of the seed of David, according to the flesh." Jesus is the "Man." (Rom. 5:12 ff). He was crucified. He ate with His disciples. There were numerous witnesses of His resurrection. Moreover Paul was too near the age which professed to know Jesus "to be successfully hoodwinked on the historical question." "Not only is Paul a genuine personality who strongly impressed himself on the life of his time....but the historicity of Jesus is also a prerequisite to Paul's Christian life and work."

An examination of the Gospels confirms this conclusion. St. Mark's gospel dwells particularly upon the human elements of Jesus. Besides these arguments, the very existence of the earthly Christian community is itself one of the most substantial evidences of his existence."

II. IN GERMAN. BY ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.

Current German publications, both periodicals and books, give abundant evidence that there is a great activity at present in the work of investigating the history of doctrine. The whole field is subjected to a thorough over-hauling. The massive sources are all passed through another examination *de novo,* more searching and more critical than ever. The standard text-books and the larger works of reference on the subject are in process of appearing in new and enlarged editions. Articles discussing the proper method of treatment in this discipline are frequent. Numerous monographs are devoted to the special investigation of individual parts of the vast field. Some authors have widened the field to include the New Testament. And not a few earnest efforts are made to extend the historical presentation beyond the Reformation and to the immediate present.

Such a keen interest in doctrinal history as these publications manifest is at once an indication and a result of an era of active theological construction. The historical basis of dogma and the historical pre-suppositions of dogmatic theology are factors whose importance is felt to-day as never before. And this principle applies to the religious life as well as to the theological doctrine. The developments of pious thought in the past are not without their influence and their value for the religious forms and the ecclesiastical polities of the present. This value is now consciously realized and that too in spite of the threatened reversion from history a few years ago. A brief survey of the chief works of recent date in the field of doctrinal history will make this evident.

Foremost among the recent appearances in this field, especially in its interest for American readers, is the new edition of Seeberg's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte.* The author claims to present an entirely new work in this edition, retaining in common with the first edition of twelve years ago nothing more than the title, the divisions, and the fundamental theological position. That the new edition is not merely an alteration of the first is manifest at once from the greatly enlarged compass of the work. The first volume of the second edition, *Die Anfänge des Dogmas im nachapostolischem und altkatholischem Zeitalter* (1908), covers 570 closely printed pages, as over against the 157 of the first edition. The second volume, *Die Dogmenbildung in der Alten Kirche* (1910), embraces 538 pages. A third and larger volume is to treat the material covered by the second volume of the first edition. So that the book has grown to nearly four times its original size, and the manner of the disposition and style of presentation are also very different. This new edition therefore places before the theological world a work of entirely new pretensions and calls our attention afresh to the fundamental position and the methodological procedure of its author. Meanwhile his shorter work on the subject, *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte,* has also passed into a second improved edition.

Reinhold Seeberg is especially competent to write authoritatively upon the history of dogma. For more than twenty years he has been actively engaged in intensive study and successful writing along these lines. Friends and students galore have earnestly desired that a detailed presentation of his theological

system might appear in book form but this he has consistently postponed until he shall have brought his historical studies to a more complete close. He is an indefatigable worker and has manifested a very unusual capacity for the rapid mastery of the vast body of sources in this subject. When as a Private Docent at Dorpat he undertook together with Bonwetsch a new edition of Thomasius' celebrated History of Doctrine the success with which he treated the difficult parts assigned him secured for him wide recognition which received concrete expression in the form of a call to Erlangen as professor, 1889. Here he worked by the side of Frank who was Thomasius' successor, and together they labored to preserve the traditions of Hofmann and Thomasius. But Seeberg's independent spirit and scientific merit together with the demand in Prussia for parity in the theological faculties brought him a call to the chair of systematic theology in the University of Berlin (1898) whither Harnack had gone after he had issued his epoch-making history. Harnack's method of treatment based upon the theory of the Hellenistic origin of the doctrines in the Ancient Church had produced a sensation completely revolutionizing the discipline and raising a host of questions that could be answered only by a thorough investigation of the whole field. The new comprehensive Lehrbuch by Seeberg is one of the results.

The literary method of the second edition differs happily from that of the first in that the flowing style of the author is brought into larger play. His rare descriptive powers are called into action and literary unity completeness of style are achieved. The continuity of the story is not broken by superfluous matter. The first edition was too largely a compilation of citations from the sources. The author was scarcely more than a director of the various voices of his authorities. The critical judgment and the historical valuation of the materials was barely indicated. The criticism of opposing views was kept at a minimum. The text was burdened with a mass of Greek and Latin quotations. It was too large for comfortable use as a text-book and too small to fill the place of a book of reference. The work was intended throughout to be supplemented and properly disposed in the oral presentation.

But the plan of the new work is entirely different. It is intended to be not a "Lernbuch" but a "Lehrbuch,"—not merely for

pupils in the class-room but for mature theologians, for teachers and real students capable of original thought and sharp concentrated attention. The citations from the sources are less frequent than in the first edition; the references are more, but they are relegated largely to the foot-notes. The connected historical presentation is allowed complete sway. The full beauty of Seeberg's unique style receives its due expression, especially in the second volume. The plastic pen of the author is felt everywhere in the masterful sketches of periods, in vivid portrayal of personalities and their development, and in the clear descriptions of ends and means. We do not mean to assert, however, that the work is light in its material or easy in its reading. He who would find a straight and simple course through the history of doctrines should pass by the master and turn to the dilettanti. The master must portray the actual facts of the historical development and the actual facts are not straight and simple but complex, crooked, and curved. Seeberg's Lehrbuch offers no cheap and easy perspicuity of subject-matter but in fidelity to approved historical method demands of the reader that he follow the author patiently and carefully, step by step, into the complicated details of the development and through all the dangerous tangled windings of the way. In fact it may be regarded as a contribution that will be of practical value in the solution of some of the present-day problems concerning historical method.

The first real official formulation of dogmas takes place in the fourth and fifth centuries and this process Seeberg details in his second volume. But this was preceded by a long period of preparation for the ecclesiastical sanction of these doctrinal norms. This period fills the first volume. The chief activity of the apostolic fathers was the homiletical exegesis and the practical application of the evangelical truth. Then came the great crisis of the Ancient Church in the heresies of the syncretistic gnostics, the reformatory efforts of Marcian, and the reactionary Montanists. This crisis left its mark. Henceforth the apologetes seek to commend the Christian truth to the learned heathen by casting it into the philosophic forms of thought current at that time. Irenaeus finds theoretical forms for Christian proclamations hitherto purely practical. Thus the basis is laid for a scientific theology in the West. Gradually the Church comes to be looked upon as the guardian of the truth, but as yet no public decrees

are passed. In the East neo-platonism proposes to replace religion with philosophy. This leaves its impression upon Christianity, as witness the theology of Clement and Origin. Serious controversies arise among the Christians themselves and these lead to the ecclesiastical constructions of doctrine in the fourth and fifth centuries. These constructions are described in the second volume under three heads: the doctrine of the Trinity, the Christological doctrine, the completion of doctrinal construction in the East, and the Western conception of the Church and the means of grace. (Augustine).

The fundamental position of Seeberg's history will perhaps be best understood by contrast with that of Harnack and comparison with that of Loofs. For Harnack's large *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* is also passing through a new edition, the fourth since its first appearance in 1885. The first and second volumes have already appeared, thoroughly revised and somewhat enlarged. His description of primitive and apostolic Christianity has undergone a number of changes to make it conform to the most recent conclusions concerning the life of Jesus and the Apostolic Age. It is interesting in this connection to note how this tried historian and leader among the liberal theologians regards the rapid advance of the latest newcomer in theology, the religio-historical method. He says that he regards it as a mark of progress, "but I am unshaken in my conviction that the central thoughts concerning the Person and the message of Jesus were a possession already of the primitive Church. They rest upon facts,—facts seen in the light of the Messianic idea, or else facts transformed through that idea. As a rule no further explanation than these facts is needed to account for the origin of Christianity and its essence. And I do not doubt that this constant effort to trace all ideas and expressions to their origin in dim antiquity is productive of no little confusion and misunderstanding. For it may easily be taken to mean that the original connection and content of such forms and expressions still inheres in them unchanged." This is solid argument: the outcome must not be identified or confused with the source, nor content with form. We could wish that Harnack would bear this in mind later on when he comes to write of the evolutionary "degeneration" of Christianity in the Hellenistic formulations of the fourth and fifth centuries.

In commenting upon this new edition of his Lehrbuch, Harnack remarks that his pioneer work in this field twenty-six years ago has called forth a number of worthy works on the subject, but that in plan and execution they are all so dependent upon his own work that no real advance has been made. But if we turn to Seeberg and Loofs, the two works usually ranged alongside of Harnack, we find a depth of original research, a skill of presentation, and a difference of fundamental position, which constitute them free and really independent productions of no inconsiderable merit. In several respects at least Seeberg is even superior to Harnack. In the first place and in general, the dogmatic constructive element is less in evidence with Seeberg the dogmatician than with Harnack the Church Historian. Then too, the underlying conception of the validity of dogma is very different with Seeberg from what it is with Harnack. This difference in attitude towards the dogmas of the Church makes itself felt at every point.

The definition of dogma is in each case practically the same. Dogma is the official ecclesiastical expression of the faith held by the Church at large. The Church demands that her dogmas be recognized by her members or at least by her teachers. The history of dogma must therefore show the historical development of these norms of truth held and taught by Christianity or by particular Christian churches. It cannot include every theological opinion more or less widely held. Even the theologians of the fourth century distinguished clearly between *Theologumenon* and *Dogma,* and the doctrinal historian of to-day should certainly not be more theological than the fathers were. It is the normative character of the dogmas which distinguishes the history of doctrine from the history of theology. Thus far the three historians agree and unite in resisting the constantly growing demand for a different conception of their task.

But the divergence of view as to the validity of the dogmas formulated by the Ancient Church leads to different methods of procedure. Harnack denies the authority of the Church and maintains that Luther's Reformation abolished all dogma. Protestant Christianity dare not be dogmatic. The dogmatic constructions of the Ancient Church constituted a degeneration of the original essence, a Hellenistic corruption of the primitive gospel of Jesus. The right of individual judgment recognized in

the Reformation permits of a return to the sources and the serene enjoyment of the bare "kernel." Accordingly Harnack traces the history of dogma to the Protestant emancipation from the corrupting influence of ecclesiastical authority and stops there. Loofs and Seeberg on the other hand maintain that Luther's Reformation abrogated not the dogmas themselves but only their infallibility. Against dogmas as such they have no objection whatever. The dogmas may or may not be correct. The mere fact that dogmas were made, that Christian content was cast into the scientific forms of Greek philosophic thought was not a perversion of Christianity itself, any more than the translation of Lutheran theology into English forms of expression is a perversion of that theology. It was a necessary step in the historical evolution. Seeberg and Loofs acknowledge the validity of the Catholic dogmas and the possibility of further dogmas within the Protestant Churches. But as a matter of fact there have been no official normative pronouncements of dogma in the Protestant Churches since the Formula of Concord in 1580 and the Helvetian Concensus of 1675. These constructions therefore close the actual doctrinal development for Protestantism and end the historical accounts of Seeberg and Loofs. What has since been achieved with reference to Christian doctrine belongs to a special discipline of Church History, the history of theology, and constitutes in itself no small subject.

Neither Seeberg nor Loofs agrees with Harnack in his conception of the task involved in the history of dogma, and neither of them has been satisfied with a mere copious monograph on the doctrinal constructions of the fourth century. They both agree in their definition of dogma and in their understanding of their duty as writers of doctrinal history. The chief point of divergence between them lies in their differing attitude towards the inner content of the individual dogmas. Seeberg is strongly influenced in his dogmatic theology by the Erlangen school now extant, while Loofs has received his controlling theological impulse from Albrecht Ritschl. Accordingly, while they both aim at a historico-genetic presentation of the process of doctrinal construction, Seeberg inclines more towards the confessionalistic Lutheran group of writers who come to the conclusion that the doctrinal content of the Book of Concord is a fundamentally correct exhibition of the truth revealed in the Scriptures. Seeberg is

more readable than Loofs, but Loofs makes more of an effort in connection with his development of the dogmas to set in relief the individualities of the more important Church Fathers.

Apart from these three great authorities in this field a number of lesser voices have asked for a hearing on the subject. Among these is Theodore Kolde of Erlangen. In a lengthy essay in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (vol. 19, pp. 485 sqq., *Dogma und Dogmengeschichte*), he advocates a new method of procedure which if adopted would lead to a practical transformation of the discipline. The large works of reference, he says, have made a methodological mistake in their definition of dogma. In limiting the concept of dogma to that which has received official ecclesiastical sanction they have thought to fulfil their task when they have traced the events and developments leading to that sanction. But the ecclesiastical pronouncement of the theologians is by no means the whole nor even the chief part of the dogma. Far more important is the common faith of the masses. The current accepted definition of the task of doctrinal history is therefore inadequate and neglects the most vital element in the life of the Church and the growth of her doctrine.

The real back-bone of a good history of doctrine, according to Kolde, will be found in a history of the forms of worship. The cultus which represents the real status of pious thought should constitute the point of departure for the historical presentation and for the historian's choice of materials. The final expression of dogmas has always been the work of theology, but the actual process of their growth in essence can be learned only from the usages of worship. We must distinguish clearly. The history of worship constitutes a far more important factor in the history of dogma than does the history of theology. If dogma is the formula which expresses the believing consciousness of the Church, it may most easily be found in the established religious rites, especially where these are regulated by statute. The vast majority of Christians have little concern and small understanding of the official confessions. But they do have some concern and understanding of the ceremonies of worship and here is where the real dogma, the common faith, receives its true expression.

Such is Kolde's plea. That there is a large element of truth in his argument is admitted. Greater emphasis upon the his-

tory of worship and more regard for the religious consciousness expressed in the cultus is a desideratum. But it may be doubted whether this element should have the central determining position which Kolde would assign it in the history of dogma. The cultus can not be regarded as an independent and calculable entity. It is in most cases the complex product of a number of factors. It is too often a means of inculcating piety rather than an expression of piety already developed. It is frequently a compromise between traditional forms and new views. History furnishes abundant evidence that liturgy and confessional subscription do not run parallel courses. This is the weakness of Kolde's proposition. The method he suggests would not by any means suffice for an adequate account of the actual facts within the Protestant Churches. And it may be seriously questioned whether the confessional subscription which guides the catechetical instruction is not in reality a more correct expression of the common faith than are the promiscuous forms of worship, especially where these are not determined and steadied by statutory enactment.

Other methods are suggested. Troeltsch's very stimulating treatise on *Protestantisches Christentum and Kirche in der Neuzeit* in the Hinneberg compilation has suggested to other scholars the advisibility of writing the history of dogma strictly from the view-point of the growth of ideas. Certainly Troeltsch's examination of the ideas of Protestantism has given great impetus to the investigations along this line and a comprehensive study of equal merit and depth of penetration but covering the entire field of Christian history would be a valuable asset. G. Krüger's book on *Das Dogma von der Dreieinigkeit und Gottmenschheit* (1905), has suggested that such monographic presentations of the history of the individual dogmas, if extended to include all the material of the subject, would when taken together constitute a very satisfactory history of doctrine. And Harnack has recently thrown out the hint that to treat the entire subject purely from the point of view of Church Polity would be an interesting and instructive exercise, even if the result would necessarily be one-sided.

Otto Scheel, a prolific, rising young professor at Tübingen, in a double article in the *Theologische Rundschau* (1911), *Stillstand und Neubildungen in der protestantischen Geschichts-*

schreibung, reviews the entire situation as to the history of doctrine and comes to the conclusion that the main stream in this field of research has ceased to flow and that progress can now be made only by a radical change in aim and method. The current authorities on the subject through their search for ecclesiastical sanction in dogma have devoted entirely too much attention to Catholic dogmas and too little to Protestant developments. The barriers must be torn down. The history of doctrine must present the historical evolution of the present-day Christian confession. As Protestants we should not permit our history to be orientated by Catholic view-points but in clear consciousness of our Protestantism though without losing the historian's objectivity we should treat the *whole* subject from a modern stand-point. This, we think, would be a combination of the method advocated by Kolde and the plan suggested by Troeltsch's work. Perhaps Scheel has in mind to produce the work which shall introduce the new epoch and convert the stagnant pool into flowing waters.

We must at least refer to two other works of recent date that are to be classed among the histories of doctrine. One of them, Otto Ritschl's *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus,* has already been brought to notice on these pages (*vide* LUTH. QUART. vol. xl, pp. 299 sqq.). The other is Paul Tschackert's *Die Entstehung der lutherischen und der reformierten Kirchenlehre* (1910). We are concerned here only with the historical method of the works. Ritschl understands under the term dogma "any religious and theological views of Christian theologians including all ages and all tendencies," and his work is really a history of Protestant theology. Tschackert, on the other hand, retains with Seeberg, Harnack, and Loofs, the normative element in his concept of dogma, but enlarges the function of doctrinal history to include not merely the official declarations of dogma but also all the historical consequences entailed by those declarations and the "efforts of present-day dogmaticians to produce new formations of doctrine." As in the doctrinal history of the Ancient Church we do not stop when we have described the systems of Origin, Athanasius, and Augustine, but trace their consequences to the construction of dogma, so in the history of the modern Church we must show what permanent deposit has resulted from the systems of Schleiermacher, Hofmann, Ritschl, and others,—

what has become common property of religious thought and an accepted element in the common faith. This method mediates between that of Seeberg and that of Otto Ritschl.

The works of Tschackert and Otto Ritschl are only two of the many indications that a great revival of interest and a new era has begun in the investigation and connected presentation of the history of Protestant thought from the earliest Reformation to the most modern theologian.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. BOSTON.

The Life and Letters of Martin Luther, by Preserved Smith, Ph.D., with illustrations. Cloth. 6 x 8½. Pp. xvi. 490. Price $3.50 net.

The appearance of a new life of Luther is but a new testimony to the greatness of this epoch-making character. One might think that the story of his life had been told so often that nothing new remained to be said. But a reading of his life by Dr. Smith reminds us that we have not simply the story of a man's life but that of a great event, for Luther was the incarnation of a great religious movement. He was so many-sided, his relations to men and to ideas so unique, and his influence so lasting that he may be regarded from so many points of view that, after all, a new "Life" is just what we may expect. Nor is the interest in Luther confined to a narrow circle of friends or foes, for at this very time a popular magazine, *The Century,* is publishing a serial, entitled "Martin Luther and His Work," by Dr. McGiffert.

Dr. Smith came to his task with the best possible preparation, both general and special, as well as with a sympathetic attitude. He has given many years to the study of his subject and has had at his command practically everything that the libraries of Europe and America could furnish. During the last score of years much light has been shed by modern research upon Luther's career. For example, the publication (1908) of the long lost Commentary on Romans, the opening of the Vatican Archives (1904), Dr. Kroker's researches into the early life of Catharine von Bora, the great edition of Luther's Works published at Weimar, and the publication of his letters by Dr. Enders and Prof. Kawerau,—all have made a fuller view of Luther possible.

Dr. Smith has endeavored to set Luther forth as a great character rather than as a theologian. In order to do this he allows Luther to reveal himself through copious extracts from his Table Talk and Letters, "those pregnant documents in which he unlocks his heart." Of course, we are told anew that the language of Luther shows him to have been the child of a coarse age. The author hides none of his faults and exaggerates none of his virtues. "Through all his mistakes, and worse he emerges a good and conscientious as well as a very great man; a son of thunder calling down fire from heaven; a Titan hurling Pelion

upon Ossa against the hostile gods." Luther was not only a great fighter, whose "excesses of passion may be regretted," but "it must be remembered that they are the defects of his qualities, that, had he not been such a man, he would not have been the leader of the great Revolt."

In reference to Luther's connection with the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, Dr. Smith says, "an impartial student can hardly doubt that he acted conscientiously, not out of a desire to flatter a great prince, but in order to avoid what he believed to be a greater moral evil. His statement in the Babylonian captivity that he preferred bigamy to divorce, and his advice to Henry VIII in 1531, both exculpate him in this case."

"Rockwell has shown that his opinion was shared by the great majority of his contemporaries, Catholic and Protestant alike. It is harder perhaps to justify his advice to get out of the difficulty by a lie. This, however, was certainly an inheritance from the scholastic doctrine of the sacredness of confession. A priest was bound by Church law to deny all that passed in the confessional. Moreover, many of the Church Fathers had allowed a lie to be on occasions the lesser of two evils. Nevertheless, though these considerations palliate Luther's guilt, the incident will always remain, in popular imagination as well as in historic judgment, the greatest blot on his career."

Dr. Smith errs in ascribing to Luther consubstantiation as his view of our Lord's presence in the eucharist. It seems difficult for non-Lutherans to understand Luther's doctrine, which utterly repudiates any carnal or Capernaitic presence. Luther and the Lutheran Church hold that in the eucharist the whole, undivided divine-human Christ is present through a supernatural, sacramental union. This means that the glorified humanity of our Lord is present; but it denies any commingling of flesh and blood with the elements.

We commend Dr. Smith's volume. It is learned, yet simple in thought and diction. It is a real and abiding contribution to the Luther literature.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

New Testament Theology. By Henry C. Sheldon.

Under the influence of an insistent historical spirit, and in the belief that theology in its development through the long centuries has, at least in some directions, gone far afield, and so stands in need of some authoritative corrective, there has been, in comparatively recent years, a determined effort to discover and set forth the essential content of the Bible as that content lay in the mind of the writers, and as it would be understood by their immediate readers. The formulated result of such study

is Biblical Theology, and to this class of literature belongs the book under review. In the preparation of his book Dr. Sheldon has had in mind the general reader as well as the theological student and minister. This double purpose imposed certain limitations touching the division of the material, the exclusion of unnecessary technicalities and scholastic formality from the language, and the extent to which the treatment was to be carried. In a very high degree the author has accomplished what he set out to do.

The division of the material is comprehensive, and the entire discussion covers six chapters. With modifications of two of them there are three distinct doctrinal types recognized in the New Testament, the theology of Jesus, of Paul, and of John. The opening chapter discusses the sources which lie back of the New Testament writings, as the Hebrew Canon, Pharisaism, and Alexandrianism; the second chapter gives the teaching of Jesus as contained in the Synoptics; a kindred primitive type of teaching is found in the first part of the Book of Acts, the Epistle of James, and the Apocalypse; a chapter of nearly a hundred pages is given to the teachings of St. Paul, followed by a brief presentation of a *modified* Paulism as exemplified in Hebrews and First Peter; the sixth and concluding chapter elucidates the Johannine theology as given in the Fourth Gospel, and the First Epistle. Four brief epistles, Second and Third John, Second Peter and Jude, are not formally discussed, receiving only incidental notice.

A score or more of particulars, which it would be interesting to note, have been marked. Brief reference to a few of them must suffice.

Touching the authorship of several of the New Testament books, which it is still deemed necessary to discuss, Dr. Sheldon is persuaded that the Fourth Gospel, the First Epistle attributed to the same author, as also the Apocalypse, are all from the hand of John the Apostle. He is not so sure, however, that the pastorals were written by St. Paul. As to priority in time among the gospels, it is accepted that criticism has established a *probability* in favor of the Second Gospel. We are pleased to note that the groundless tendency shown by some critics to discredit the reliability of any statement found only in the First Gospel, is not shared by the author—at least not to any marked extent. In doctrinal content, the virgin-birth is accepted as an established item in historical, apostolic faith; metaphysical *kenosis*, as held by some extremists, is declared to be rationally indefensible, and exegetically gratuitous; the atonement possesses both an objective and a subjective value. As might be expected, when we come to the author's view of the sacraments, Lutherans will dissent. Baptism is "symbolical," "typical of union with Christ, instrumental to union with the visible society,

figures moral regeneration." He will not concede more than that Paul may possibly have given it a certain association with the experience of regeneration. The same view, of course, applies also to the Lord's Supper. To the judgment expressed by some that the Pauline theology makes no provision for progressive sanctification, inasmuch as it rates the experience in justification and regeneration as all-transforming, a transference into a state of essential perfection, this sharp rejoiner is given, "One can only wonder where this eccentric criticism obtained its petty inch rule for measuring the teaching of Paul."

Aside from the points indicated above we have found little from which we feel constrained to dissent, and much that we can heartily commend, in this book by Dr. Sheldon. It is a worthy treatment of a great and important theme. Every page evinces the author's thorough scholarship, his wide acquaintance with the literature of the subject, and his undoubted ability as a clear and discriminating thinker. Convictions are held firmly, confidently, and expressed in language remarkably direct and intelligible. Circumlocution, mere verbiage, are rigidly excluded. Perplexing questions which not infrequently are befogged by tedious, almost endless discussion, are disposed of in a few brief, luminous paragraphs, or pages at most. True, you may not in every instance accept the conclusion thus reached as the final one, but you at least have no difficulty in knowing what the view of the text is. We trust the book may find a wide sphere of service.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

John the Loyal; Studies in the Ministry of the Baptist. By A. J. Robertson, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. Pp. ix, 315. Price $1.25 net. Postage 14 cents.

After Jesus Himself, and Paul the great "apostle to the Gentiles," there is, perhaps, no more interesting character in all the Scriptures than John, the forerunner of Jesus. As Professor Robertson says of him, "John was like the morning star in the early dawn, a very bright and shining one indeed." Yet it is equally true that "the literature on the ministry of John is not large."

For this very reason this fine volume will be all the more welcome. It is full of life and spirit, full of faith and assurance. The work of "the critics" is not ignored, but neither is it allowed to turn the author aside from his main purpose in writing, which is stated thus in the Preface, "The book is not meant as an apologetic, and I do not feel called upon to justify every statement in the Gospels for the benefit of the modern disbeliever. I have treated such questions as occasion arose, not from a sense of com-

pulsion. It is John himself that I wish to bring before the reader, if I may, with something of his powerful personality." For the most part critical discussions are relegated to the footnotes, which are found on nearly every page.

The following quotations will give a taste of the quality of the work:

"It is from the chapter on the baptism of Jesus, headed, "Reality."

"At last John and Jesus are face to face. Jesus 'appears before John.' Out of the ages the two men of destiny meet. John had spent his years in preparation for this moment. It is the culmination of his life-work. It is the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. Silently this crisis for John has come. Like two stars the two men touch each other's path and move on. They meet only this once. John sees Jesus on two other days, but they have no converse. Jesus knows who John is, but John at first does not know who Jesus is. He was to him a stranger. .....But he had never looked into a face like that of this Stranger. John was face to face with the greatest personality in history, and felt a moral awakening in his own sensitive soul. Here was 'the Christ of Reality' standing before John, the Coming One of whom he had spoken and dreamed. In these brief moments of rapid intuition, of spiritual illumination, John may have gotten more light than he had ever received before. The mind works quickly in such supreme moments."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Biblical Geography and History. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. With maps. Pp. xviii, 296. Price $1.50 net.

Every minister, and every Bible school teacher, and indeed every reader of the Bible, ought to have some knowledge of the geography of the lands from which the Bible came, and in which the people whose life and history it describes lived. Only thus can these people be understood. Only thus can the Bible itself be understood.

Very truly does Professor Kent write in the Preface to this volume, "No other commentary upon the literature of the Bible is so practical and luminous as biblical geography. Throughout their long history the Hebrews were keenly attentive to the voice of the Eternal speaking to them through nature. Their writings abound in references and figures taken from the picturesque scenes and peculiar life of Palestine. The grim encircling desert, the strange water courses, losing themselves at times in their rocky beds, fertile Carmel and snow-clad Hermon, the resounding sea and the storm-lashed waters of Galilee are but a few of the many physical characteristics of Palestine that have

left their indellible marks upon the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. The same is true of Israel's unique faith and institutions. Biblical geography therefore, is not a study by itself, but the natural introduction to all other biblical studies."

Very few Bible students, however, are privileged even to visit these Bible lands and to study them by actual personal observation. We owe much, therefore, to such capable scholars as Professor Kent, who gives us the results of their study, and travel and observations.

The book under review is divided into two parts. Part I treats of the Physical Geography of the Biblical World, while Part II is devoted to Historical Geography. In both parts there is an abundance of most valuable information which throws floods of light on the Scriptures, and it is all written in such simple, clear and forceful English that it requires no technical training to read and understand.

Of course, as might be expected from Professor Kent, there is an effort, especially in Part II, to discredit or explain away everything supernatural and miraculous. For example, in treating of the Historical Facts Underlying the Plague Stories, he writes, "The seven plagues described in the oldest biblical narratives were not miracles, but the natural catastrophes which from time to time have afflicted the land of Egypt." (p. 112). Again, in the paragraph dealing with the capture of Jericho, we have this, "These excavations both confirm and supplement the biblical account of the conquest of Jericho. The walls are better preserved than those of any other Canaanite city thus far uncovered, indicating, as the oldest Hebrew narrative implies, that the city was captured by stratagem rather than by siege, or as the later tradition suggests as the result of a miracle. The story of the spies in the first chapter of Joshua shows that the Hebrews had friends within the city itself. The probabilities are that, while they were marching around the Canaanite stronghold and thus distracting the attention of the defenders, at a preconcerted signal the gates were suddenly opened and the Hebrews rushed in and captured the city." (p. 126).

But such passages are infrequent and not of great moment. Many Bible students to-day will sympathize with the author's views, and those who do not can easily make the needed corrections.

On the whole, we regard this volume as a model of its kind. Even those who may already have some of the older and larger books dealing with the same or kindred subjects, cannot well afford to be without this thoroughly modern and up-to-date textbook.

There are sixteen most excellent maps, nearly all of them colored, and several of them folded maps of considerable size, and all of them adding greatly to the value of the book. A

rather unique feature is a list of "one hundred and forty stereographs (or, if preferred for class and lecture use, stereopticon slides) that illustrate the most important events in biblical geography and history." Numbers referring to these are inserted in the body of the text, and there is an "Appendix" with titles corresponding to each number. There is also a very full and complete index.

The mechanical work, paper, print, binding, etc., are all in the excellent style which is characteristic of the publishers.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION. COLUMBIA, S. C.

The Sacramental Feast...A Communion Book to aid the devout Communicant Worthily to Eat and to Drink at the Lord's Table. By Charles Armand Miller, Pastor of St. John's Ev. Luth. Church at Charleston, S. C. Pp. 108. Price 50 cts.

The aim of this excellent manual is well defined in the title, and especially in the sub-title. It is intended to perform the same office for English-speaking Lutherans, that is fulfilled in the Church of the Fatherland by the well-known "Communion Books." There are chapters on the Feast, the Invitation, the Preparation, the Wedding Garment, etc. In these much valuable instruction is given as to the nature of the Lord's Supper, the proper spirit in which to receive it, and the benefits and blessings that may be expected from it.

Nearly fifty pages are taken up with "Questions for Self-examination, according to the Ten Commandments." These questions follow the general lines suggested by Luther's explanations of the Commandments found in his Small Catechism, but take a much wider range. Indeed, it would seem as if there were no sin, fault, weakness or failure, of which a Christian could possibly be guilty, which is not covered by these "questions." They form a most exhaustive and really wonderful course of spiritual analysis and self-examination. It is a question whether it would be either helpful or wise to put the soul through such a "quiz" as is here provided for. It savors too much of the "third degree" as practiced in some of our police courts, and would be likely to awaken a morbid and very unwholesome condition of mind and heart.

One of the most admirable features of the book is the prayers suitable for use before, during, and after, the sacramental feast, scattered throughout the volume. Most of them are translations from old German books of devotion, and from such masters of spiritual exercise as Luther, John Arndt, Loehe, etc.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

Around the Home Table. By Rev. J. C. Jacoby, A.M., D.D., pastor of Trinity Ev. Luth. Church, Boulder, Colo. Pp. 367. Price $1.00 net.

It is a compliment both to the author, and to the discriminating judgment of the people, that there has been a demand for a new edition of this excellent manual for home reading. The former text has been carefully revised, and two new chapters have been added, one on The Inspiration of the Scriptures, and the other on The Immortality of the Soul. Both of these are subjects which are now attracting much thought and discussion and in reference to which it is important that our parents and young people should have clear and sound instruction, such as Dr. Jacoby gives them in his book. Other subjects discussed are, Justification, The Token of the Covenant (Baptism), The Children of the Covenant, The Lord's Supper, The Christian Home, The Sabbath, Marriage, etc., etc. The author has brought to the discussion of these important subjects the fruits of years of careful study, illuminated by his practical experience as a pastor, and the result has been a book most admirably adapted to its purposes. We heartily commend it to our own people, and to all evangelical Christians who desire to hold fast to "the faith once delivered unto the saints."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

HOLZAPFEL PUBLISHING COMPANY. CLEONA, PA.

Not in His Steps. By Rev. Francis T. Hoover, M.A., with an Introduction by Rev. William E. Park, D.D. Illustrated. Pp. 360. Price $1.00 to $2.00 according to binding. Sold by subscription only.

This is a book with a mission. It is a well written story, intended to illustrate the folly and wickedness of the prejudice against ministers of mature age which exists in so many churches. It gives the history of a congregation which cruelly dismissed their pastor, or compelled him to resign, because he had reached the "dead-line of fifty years," and of their sad experiences in hearing "candidates," and with two young men whom they called successively as pastor. Finally, having learned their lesson, they repented of their previous folly and recalled their former pastor, against whom there never had been any objection except his "fifty years," and his increasing gray hairs.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

EATON & MAINS. NEW YORK.

The Social Engineer. By Edwin L. Earp, Professor of Chris-

tian Sociology, Drew Theological Seminary. Pp. xxiii, 326. Price $1.50 net.

We have here not only a new book, but a distinctively new term, "The Social Engineer." The author seems to feel that this new use and application of the word "engineer" needs some explanation and justification. Hence on page xviii of the Introduction he defines it as follows: "The religious social engineer is one who can help the religious leader to establish a desired working force in any field of need, and keep it in sympathetic co-operation with all other forces working for the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth in harmony with the program and leadership of Jesus Christ." This definition is constantly being expanded and filled in, as the discussion proceeds, and long before the end of the book is reached, the reader comes to feel that it is just the term needed, and to wonder how we did without it so long.

The book was written, the author tells us, "to meet a felt need now being given intelligent expression by men's clubs, brotherhoods, Bible classes, Young Men's Christian Association classes, and other organizations with philanthropic motives, for a textbook on social studies and actual social service." We believe that it will be found admirably adapted to this purpose. The author's style is clear and forceful. His grasp of the subject is broad and vigorous. His matter is arranged logically and systematically. Any thoughtful person of ordinary intelligence, can read this book understandingly and profitably, yet there is much to instruct and inspire even those who are already familiar with the general subject through other reading and study.

The book is divided into two parts. Part I is headed, "The Social Engineer in the Making." This might be called the theoretical discussion of the subject. It has eleven chapters dealing with such topics as "The Social Consciousness," "Social Organization," "Social Machinery," "Social Progress," "Social Leadership," etc.

Part II has for its title, "The Social Engineer at Work." It has fifteen chapters, dealing with such practical questions as "The Meaning of Social Service," "Socialized Charity," "Team Work for the Community," "Preventive Salvation," "The Church and the Workingman," "The Social Causes of the Boy Problem," etc.

All through the book, and especially in Part II, much emphasis is laid on prevention work. Evidently Prof: Earp believes thoroughly in the old proverb, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." He insists constantly that the best way to remedy a social evil is to remove the causes of it. "What I have tried to emphasize in all these chapters is this: That while we are doing the work of rescue, and providing remedial agencies for the many delinquent, dependent, and defective classes in so-

ciety, we should not fail to see that to secure any permanent results for social progress we must place supreme emphasis upon those forms of social service that deal in a positive way with the preventable causes of social ills that are known. We should not spend all our time in organizing sewing circles to patch the pants of poverty, when we ought to be engaged in reforms that will clothe men in the garments of righteousness, so that they will render social justice to their fellows and make poverty less prevalent if not altogether impossible." Pp. 271, 272.

We cannot forbear quoting a few more sentences in illustration of the author's quiet vein of humor and sarcasm, and his happy way of putting things.

"I sometimes think the real reason the disciples toiled all night and had taken nothing was because they had cast their net on the wrong side of the ship, or, to put it in another way, they had put the ship between the net and the fish, for when, at the command of Jesus, they cast their net on the right side of the ship, it was 'filled with a multitude of fishes.' It seems sometimes that as 'fishers of men' we get the organization between our real purpose and the people. We seem to spend more time in holding meetings and banquets, and geeing and hawing over points of constitutionality and parliamentary practice than in actual work in the fields of opportunity." (P. 16).

"We have seen in every community, especially in Church and Sunday School work, persons possessing ability, yet lacking in the confidence of the people; like a pretty, noble-looking horse my father owned once that could pull a mighty load on occasions, but would invariably balk on a hill when you needed him most. We never could depend upon him—he was worthless for team work." (P. 67).

" 'Take to heart what your wife says to you when she is angry with you,' was the advice once given to me by a friend who had observed from long experience as a man of affairs how difficult a thing it is for a man to see his own faults, and how seldom he has the privilege of hearing them rehearsed by his friends or even his enemies." (P. 119).

The volume is attractively printed and bound, and has a good "Bibliography," and an unusually complete and satisfactory index, both of which add largely to its practical value.

Modern Thought and Traditional Faith. By George Preston Mains. Pp. xv. 279. Price $1.50 net.

This book is by one of the members of the well-known Methodist Publishing House of Eton & Mains. It is the result of much reading and study carried on, as the author himself tells us, during the "intervals which have come as fragments of leisure in the midst of exacting duties. It has been written mostly in my home library, and in the quiet hours of early night."

The book is addressed chiefly to the clergy and intelligent laymen of the Methodist Church, and is a plea for a sympathetic and tolerant attitude towards the processes and results of a conservative and constructive higher criticism. There is, however, nothing of a denominational or sectarian character about the discussion of the subject, nothing which could make the book less acceptable, or less valuable, to the ministers or members of any other evangelical Church.

The author seems to accept, practically, all the conclusions of the "higher critics." The evolutionary philosophy, the antiquity of the human race, "that man for many times the period of six thousand years has been a citizen of the earth," "the documentary theory" as to the origin of the historical books of the Old Testament, that "Genesis in its compilation and present form is one of the most recent books of the Old Testament," that "many of the stories which appear in the earlier records of the Old Testament were simply taken over and adapted from older mythical or legendary sources, and that they are not to be taken at face value as sober and measured history," that we have in the Bible neither an infallible nor an inerrant book but "a book very human in its character, faithfully reflecting the thought-process, early and late, of the races with which it deals," and much more of the same kind.

At the same time, he maintains, that "at no time during its history has the Bible as a book been so unincumbered with human traditions, with false interpretations; at no time has it been so pure in its text, so well known in its literary history and in the chronological order of its books, as at present. Never before have its spiritual teachings shone so beautifully, and never has the historic Christ stood forth from its pages so impressively as to-day. The Bible was never so well understood, and never has it had so free opportunity to speak forth its own unmixed and original messages, as to-day."

He declares further, that "the critical process has not disturbed, much less marred, a single promise or privilege which the older Bible held out to the Christian worshipper. In this record there still stands in untarnished beauty the doctrines of the Fatherhood of God, of redemption and forgiveness of sin through Jesus Christ, and of the witness of the Spirit to pardoning grace and to the blessed and joyful fellowship in God's family."

The book is well written and is well worth a careful and thoughtful reading especially at this time when the faith of many is being disturbed, and when it seems to many as though the very foundations were being removed from under the great verities of our Christian faith and hope.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO.

Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology, Vol. II. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D.D., LL.D.

This is a second and rewritten edition of an earlier work, prepared more than twenty years ago. The chief purpose was to provide a suitable text-book for use in the classroom of the theological seminary.

Intended primarily for ministers and students we need not more minutely describe the book than to say that this second volume has to do with three departments of Christian theology, historical, systematic and practical. The fundamental definitions, divisions, the scope, place, outline and relation of these large and important branches of theological science, are given as briefly as is consistent with clearness. The presentation of each chief subject is followed by a list of authorities—adjudged by the author to be the very best. Without any disposition to be critical the reviewer cannot wholly repress the query why certain books are included, and certain others are omitted. As an example of omission we may mention that we have not found "The Confessional History of the Lutheran Church," by Dr. Richard, listed.

The subject matter of this book, and in many instances the precise form in which it is given, are largely drawn from other sources. Hagenbach, Oehler and Krauth are chiefly placed under contribution. In some instances the entire outline of elaborate discussions of important subjects has been transferred to these pages. The author has been unstinted in research and labor. Volumes by the score must have been examined in order to secure what is here offered.

The book may be commended not only to ministers and students, for whom it was primarily intended, but also to intelligent and interested members of the laity. Few of these have the inclination or the time to delve exhaustively into these subjects, yet surely, in these times of numerous and various beliefs, every earnest Christian should desire to be able to give an intelligent reason for the faith that is in him. Such an one will find here a veritable storehouse. From it he may draw the answer to many perplexing questions. He will hardly find it interesting for contiuous reading. It is too much like a dictionary for that. If, however, he will resort to it again and again, take up its subjects in order, study them with earnestness and care, he will find ample reward not only in the enlargement of religious and theological knowledge, but also in an awakened and clarified Christian consciousness.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1911.

ARTICLE I.

FOREIGN MISSIONS AS A WORKING BASIS FOR LUTHERAN UNITY.

REV. L. B. WOLF, D.D.

Christian unity, and how to realize it, is worthy the Church's serious attention. That the whole subject is involved in great difficulties, is no good reason against its being considered by all Christ's followers.

In His prayer for the future Church, He expressed clearly the thought of union among His followers.

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they may all be one; as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they may also be one in us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me."

Here the nature of the union, as between Father and Son, the means to secure it, the Word, and the end or purpose, that Christ may be accepted as God-sent, are all involved and clearly set forth.

Foreign missions is helpful in a two-fold manner toward the realization of unity. On the one hand it presents virgin soil, in which to begin operations without there being in the mind of the heathen world the bias of our denominational peculiarities, differences or idosyncracies, and on the other it has a task before it to which it calls the Church which can only be accomplished by the most effective means at her disposal and by the wisest use of her forces. It may be safely assumed as sound, to hold that a united Christianity, working with the least possible friction and waste, and with the largest harmony, shall be able

most successfully to proclaim our holy faith and discharge our responsibility to a non-evangelized world.

Movements in the mission fields call the attention of the Church most definitely to reconsider her position on Christian unity.

The Protestant Episcopal Church at the Cincinnati Conference uttered her faith, which Cardinal Gibbons recently commended as "reflecting honor on their heads and hearts."

As he views the matter of Christian unity, it is attainable "only where government is maintained as no less essential to the Church of Christ than unity of doctrine," and this essential condition is found only, he holds, in Rome.

But we are not permitted by our subject to discuss the wider phase of Christian unity; nor to show how foreign missions furnish a basis for all Protestant, and some think, for all Christian bodies, but to refer only to the question from the standpoint of Lutheranism. Does the foreign mission enterprise furnish a basis for Lutheran unity? If it presents a *practical* basis for all Protestants and a *possible* one, as intimated, for the whole of Christianity, then it must follow that it affords the necessary working basis on which unity should be realized most fully in the Lutheran Church.

Again, whether this is admitted or not, whether it can be maintained or not, it is certainly true, that the presence of so great a task calls for the utilization of all the forces at our command in the most effective way; and it will generally be conceded by all as a truth of much potency that in union of action there is strength and the promise of ultimate victory.

We claim only limited vision and experience, both in the practical work of missions and in the realization of co-operation in the foreign field. But what follows is not theory but what has been gained in the school of experience, and among our Lutheran missions in the Empire of India. And lest misunderstanding should arise, it may be well to lay down the general proposition that *essential doctrinal agreement in fundamentals* must be held as necessary to successful agreement in missionary work. Where this is absent, unity cannot be secured or maintained with any effectiveness. Oneness in government is not in our opinion nearly so essential as doctrine, in effecting Christian unity, though here is where the line of cleavage is deepest among Protestantism and between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism.

Now this being admitted as a preliminary consideration, we maintain that in all parts of the Lutheran Church and in all lands doctrinal agreement is sufficiently attained to constitute a working basis for all divisions and nationalities of our Lutheran fold. Nowhere more surely is this true than among Lutheran missionaries at their great task before a heathen world.

There have been secured such practical results in the work and among the workers, as must of necessity have followed from doctrinal agreement.

In the foreign field Lutheranism, as our expression of Christian thought and life has many advantages over other conceptions and schools of thought. On the question of church government, she has no hard and fast rule to maintain. She can adopt any of the existing forms and have historical sanction for the same in her past. In doctrine she has a simple,but remarkably comprehensive creed which from the first, has helped her in confessing her Lord among the nations. Her Augustana stand as one of the most translatable, if not the most easily translated of symbols—a marvellous compendium of the faith, setting forth the fundamentals of Christian truth in clearness, and unencumbered with strained interpretations of the gospel message or conceptions of the divine plan.

But how does the foreign mission field present so advantageous a basis for Lutheran unity? Let us face our task as a great Church. We are all aware how linguistic barriers and national peculiarities militate against Lutheran unity, even where we all confess our faith in the common symbol of Lutheranism. It is natural for Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, Finns, et. al., to flow together, impelled by their common national ties. But it is not so easy to weld these national traits and the many-tongued sons of Luther together so as to form what they should be, because of their common faith, the mightiest force in Protestantism, numercially and doctrinally, as well as practically. When, however, the national elements meet in China, Japan, India, or Africa, the problems assume a different aspect. Each has not a large work to do among those who speak their own tongue as here in America, but all find a common task, a common foe—one mighty work, to make the Lord of life known; and the common faith which they express in the Augustana, becomes the common rallying ground from which to start against the common enemy, and to do the common work. We had no idea how easy it would

be to draw together the nations represented in the Lutheran Church of India until we tried it, and then as true Lutherans, we did not begin at the outskirts of the problem, but we started with our faith as expressed in our Church confession—the Augsburg—and put *first* things *first, what we* held ought to be taught; and church government and missionary methods as second, concerning which we hoped to learn constantly from each other.[1]

We came together, it is true, impelled by our stupendous task and to learn how to do it best. That must draw all Christians together. But we should not be so superficial as to put this and the study of the best methods of doing it, before the essential and fundamental truths which our Church confesses and has confessed from the beginning of her history. We have studied methods and have been mutually benefitted. But this is small as compared with the growing unity and the strength that unity affords and develops in the performance of the mighty work to be done. Our Lutheran unity attained already is not all that is possible, either in character or effectiveness, but it has produced such fruit already as to show what are its possibilities.

Let us note briefly the past accomplishment and sketch some possible undertakings.

An understanding of conditions in our India Lutheran Church is important. We are scattered from Cape Comorin to the Himalayan Mountains. Our missions represent nationally the most prominent Lutheran lands. Our work is done in many vernaculars and dialects. Our problems are somewhat dissimilar due to linguistic and other considerations. Yet notwithstanding these they are very largely alike in ultimate aim. We agree that we could begin united work among our twelve missions in the language of modern educated India—the English. And so five years ago, and let it be said not at the instigation of those whose tongue it was, but at the suggestion of those who spoke other tongues, we united in publishing a common organ, *The Gospel Witness.*

Within the Telugu area among four missions, two American with some Swedish and Danish and German elements, we determined to furnish the same Lutheran literature and common ritual and have been jointly supporting a literary editor who is

1 Guntur Conference agreed on Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechisms as a doctrinal basis.

providing Sunday School Lesson Helps and other books for our congregations and parochical schools, Sunday Schools and Gospel Workers.

We have worked out a common examination scheme for all grades of Gospel workers, maintain a central examination board whose duties are to examine all candidates for the missions in the subjects agreed upon by the central board of the co-operating missions.

The general spirit elicited by these combined efforts of the missionaries has been most beneficial and has reacted most helpfully upon the native Church and native workers in the whole Telugu field.

Unrealized aims that should be pushed to completion are worth noting and urging.

1. Within suitable language areas there should be a *union theological seminary.*[2] Preliminary steps were taken to establish this but it may be too soon to say what hindrances were encountered, as it might prevent the realization of the desired end. There can be no valid excuse for maintaining four separate theological training schools in the Telugu language area, when one good one could do all the work and do it more effectively. If the theological work is to be carried on in English, there is no reason why a common training school should not be maintained by all who confess the Augsburg Confession and acknowledge the symbols of our Church as a correct interpretation of God's Word. This aim is not being forgotten and the coming joint conference of 1912 may again revive an interest in it which the home Churches and Boards would do well to heed and make effective.

In general, in all institutional work, leper asylums, industrial plants for training workers, normal schools, hospital work, &c., every reason exists for intermissionary effort. Our Boards ought to allow the native Lutheran Church to grow together, to cultivate the common inheritance of our Lutheran history and doctrinal development and to build up a strong Lutheran consciousness within the India Church by maintaining that faith which centers around the person of Christ and which makes the testimony of our Lutheran Church so valuable an element in the

2 Last summer steps were taken to unite all Lutheran Missions in a Joint College at Guntur and a Joint Theological School in Madras in which English shall be the language used and our Boards have been asked to cooperate.

mighty task, the whole Church of Christ must accomplish in India and in the world.

So long as fidelity to the faith of Christ as confessed by our Church is maintained, the more unitedly our Lutheran missionaries and missions act, the greater the result will be to the kingdom and the more influential factor in hastening the coming of that kingdom they will become. The Lutheran Church maintains a Christology that India in the years to come will appreciate, as she rediscovers the wealth of our past thought on this central doctrine. We dare not allow thinly veiled monism to usurp the place of a stalwart Christology. Through the much lauded liberal theology of the West, it is to be feared that a weak soteriology may find its way to that land, where *Monism* has maintained sway for past centuries.

Preliminary to the missions getting together more closely and working more unitedly in the foreign field, may we in conclusion make the following suggestions:

1. We ought to agree on the home field to place no barrier in the way of unity of action when the forces, in the front are agreed to move together. This is fundamental. We are not set to establish our American, German, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, or any other national species of the Lutheran Church in any foreign land. We are called to establish a Chinese, India, Japan Church in the faith of Luther and his followers, if such an interpretation of the Gospel message appeals to those who shall be won from heathenism by our missionary enterprise and effort. We shall do our work best, in our humble opinion, if we allow that broad faith and liberty, which characterized our founder to find expression in the new Church's life, ever remembering and insisting upon the great principle of loyalty to God's Word, and to the faith of the Church as founded on that Word.

2. But more than this, we should labor to draw closer together our home forces, so as to furnish a worthy example to our missions of our common faith and unity derived therefrom. Our missionaries have a rather serious task in differentiating our American species of Lutheranism in India for example. The native Church can easily grasp our national and linguistic differences, but find it hard to see in these any adequate reason for difference in our common faith and in our views on Christ and His great salvation. Our common task, our common aim,

in all our foreign work cannot but draw us nearer together at home. Were we to meet and talk over the stupendous task before our *common Lutheranism,* both because of our position in the world ecclesiastically, doctrinally and numercially, and also because of the vast potentiality of personality and wealth at our command, it would, without doubt, put to rest, minor differences between us. Our great responsibility, in the greatest undertaking in the world, and our position of advantage in undertaking a large share of the task because of our ability and resources, will fill our churches with that uniting bond that would cause all lesser interests to be forgotten in our common struggle for our common Lord.

3 Finally, let us remember that the problem of Church unity is primarily one, the solution of which must be found in the home Church. It is left to home Boards and their constituting constituency to make the real advance possible for which the Church on the foreign field is waiting,—union at home so as to give force and direction to every movement that is made toward union on the foreign field.

If it is true that unity is something richer, grander, more comprehensive, than anything we can see at present, then ought our Lutheran Church strive for it "with every power engaged," thus helping, in full loyalty to Christ, to answer His prayer to our Father, "that the world may believe that Thou hast sent one."

If "unity is, in fact, a synonym for the life of the body of Christ," then it must express itself in our dear Church, as it walks nearer His side, as well as in the whole body of Christ. For this we should all humbly pray that it may find expression through us both at home and abroad, more and more increasingly.

The striking words of the Bishop of Southwark on the larger unity of Christendom, might be true among our own Church in all lands: "Slowly, very slowly, directly and indirectly, by the more interior forces of religious life and by the influences of the larger changes in human thought and human life, does the Holy Spirit work to lift us out of the pits, which have been digged for our feet, to disentangle gently the meshes in which we are caught."

Baltimore, Md.

ARTICLE II.

THE MOST RECENT ASSAULTS OF THE HIGHER CRITICAL THEOLOGY ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, PH.D (LEIPSIG).

The city of Berlin, the beautiful capital of modern Germany, was just about a year ago the scene of a very remarkable demonstration. More than 20,000 people thronged the plaza outside the mammoth coloseum of the Winter Circus. They stormed and packed the building in a trice and on the outside scarce a perceptible dimunition, so spectators say, was made in the thronging, surging multitudes. And hark, hear the swelling tones of the myriad-voiced throng. They are singing Luther's Battle Hymn—"Ein Feste Burg ist unser Gott." After intense indoor and outdoor demonstrations, the people still refuse to separate and, by special permission, the new cathedral, Germany's Westminster Abbey, is thrown open and a mighty service of thanksgiving is there held, with service and sermon by the court preacher, Dr. Dryander.

What was this all about—this stirring profoundly of a great city?

It was a popular confession of Jesus Christ, very God of very God and very man of very man by children of the faith, who thus protested against an address which had been previously made in the same city by Prof. Arthur Drews in which, abetted by a number of other adherents of Haeckel's Monisten Bund, he had publicly and high-handedly denied the very existence of Him whom we know and worship as the Christ of God.

This attack of Drews is a symptom of the times, and just one of a number of assaults on the founder and centre of the Christian faith. Since Strauss, Bauer and Renan, aggressions against the person and suzrainty of Jesus Christ have been more and more frequent.

The book of Dr. Schweitzer of Strasburg,[1] "From Reimarus to Werde," gathers up and discusses a mass of these movements.

1 Dr. Albert Schweitzer—Von Reimarus zu Werde, Eine Geschichte der Lehen Jesus Forschung. Tübingen, 1906.

Later than this, Prof. Sanday of Oxford,[2] in his "Life of Christ in Recent Research," takes up the trend of this ebb and flow, attack and counter-attack in the conflict about the person of Christ. But so rapid has been the movement that even since the close of Sanday's book there have been a number of eventful happenings that are deserving of a survey. It is these I wish to present.

These new attacks are more extravagant perhaps than most, if not any, that have preceded them. They are not entirely illogical, however, when once one grants their materialistic basis, whether Monistic, Marxistic, Mythologic or Philosophic.

Indeed we shall find that though we may be abashed at the very audacity of some of the assaults, they are only notable because of a greater daring in using the same old weapons which were already forged by other hands and have been brandished in a more or less threatening way over the head of Christianity for now a very long time.

And we shall not be surprised at the number nor sharpness of the attacks. For on the one hand, as we are well aware, all historic and philologic landmarks, in all departments of thought, have been in very recent time under assault, including of course the Old and New Testaments. And on the other hand, there is general recognition that Christianity as it is stands or falls with Jesus Christ. Therefore the attack has focussed on His person.

In order that we may have a grasp of the situation I shall bring under review five several attacks on Christ, all of which are so recent that the echoes of them are still rumbling.

These five may be considered under the names of Maurnbrecher, Kautsky, Kalthoff, Jensen and Drews, in the order named. They will give us, I think, right clearly, the historical and logical development of the movement in its main essentials.

In our order of consideration we shall have a descending series.

Maurnbrecher acknowledges the reality of Jesus, grounds the work of Jesus socially, and rates His influence rather high. Kautsky acknowledges the reality of Jesus, also grounds the work of Jesus socially, but thinks His influence trifling or nil. Kalthoff, going a step further, denies the very existence of Jesus and bases Christianity on social forces. Jensen, too, denies the

2 Wm. Sanday—The Life of Christ in Recent Research. Oxford Press, 1907.

existence of Jesus and sees the origin of Christianity in Oriental Mythology. Drews emphatically rejects Jesus as a historical character and bases Christianity on literary-historical grounds. I am inclined to say: "Facilis descensus averni."

M. Maurnbrecher[3] is a socialist with theological training. He acknowledges the historicity of Jesus and gives to Him a place of influence, but he denies that Jesus is the founder of Christianity.

He sketches the life of Jesus in something of this fashion: The extent of his public activity was at most about half a year. When John the Baptist was executed, Jesus who was his disciple went on preaching with a martyr's enthusiasm the new international idea of the Kingdom of God. He set forth this preaching in Capernaum for some weeks, then must flee to escape the clutches of Herod and the Pharisees. He makes several other attempts to be heard, notably in Nazareth and Decapolis. They are failures. Then comes a flight of some months and a tempestuous ingress into Jerusalem. By his teachings, parables and attack on temple barterings he made embittered enemies of Scribe and Pharisee. His frank assertion of the overthrow of the temple was reckoned as blasphemy and led to his arrest, and as a broken and self-deceived man he is finally condemned by Pilate. Dark and hopeless were his last days. In deep despair he passes from the scene of his life's failure. Let us now see the argument of Maurnbrecher, made out of this inverted view of the world-Redeemer.

Jesus lived, true, as we have seen, a failure in a way, but He lived, though indeed He had but little to do with the founding of Christianity as a movement. Jesus was not the Messiah, had not so given Himself out, was not even a rebel against the Roman Government.

But yet Jesus gave occasion for Christianity, in His work and sympathy for the poor. The social interest, Maurnbrecher makes to dominate the work of Christ.

This emphasis at once minimizes both the national and the religious sides of Christ's life. Maurnbrecher says, "Political matters were not in the scope of Jesus' thought; He neither organized an economic communism, nor led a band of rebel troops."[4]

3 M. Maurnbrecher—Von Nazareth nach Golgotha, Eine Untersuchung.
4 Maurnbrecher—Jesus, p. 197.

His purpose was rather international, rather towards a social solidarity for all men's welfare everywhere. Naturally this is purely a civic, social matter, having to do with material bettering.

And this brings us to the chief failure of Maurnbrecher. While he internationalizes Jesus' work, he practically ignores the religious side.

The chief emphasis in the New Testament is laid on the parables which refer to the poor. They are interpreted altogether without regard to moral or religious qualities. The poor in purse—not in spirit—are the recipients of all the message and ministry. If at times it must be acknowledged that Jesus looked away to the future, this is counted only a self-deception on His part, which finally led to His discomfiture, or perhaps it is a reading into His life of what really was not there.

But it requires no stretch of imagination at all for any real student of the life of Jesus to feel and know that first and chiefest of all, Christ's consciousness of God and His oneness with the divine, not mere social economies, were the real foci of His life. Rich and poor were alike to Him—if they were poor in spirit, or if they hungered and thirsted after righteousness. He reprimands the rich barn builder, not because he is rich, but because he has left God out of account. He calls to question the poor man who is over anxious about the morrow, because he fails to take God's care into account. Recall, too, how Jesus attacks Scribes and Pharisees not only as a class but to show the inner motive of the Gospel. Even Maurnbrecher himself acknowledges that Jesus in much of His dealing sets moral purity above cultural purity.

One cannot at all interpret the essence of Jesus' teaching as essentially and first of all social. Says Windisch,[5] "Maurnrecher must himself have felt that his derivation of all the expressions of Jesus out of pure proletarian instincts and motives does violence to the spirit of Jesus and leads to an altogether false construction of His teaching and life. The Gospel of Jesus is too broad and pure to permit itself to be grasped through such a modern constructive principle."

Maurnbrecher builds Christianity on the idea, at home in

5 H. Windisch, Leipzig—Der Geschichtliche Jesus Theologische Rundschau June 1910, prg. 215. Privat docent, N. Test., Leipzig.

Jewish thought as he says, of the "Son of Man." The New Testament passages on the Son of Man he accepts in general, attaching to them significance apart from the person of Christ, who he says, referred to a third person and not to Himself—and thus grounded the new movement in an already fixed idea held by the Jews—namely the "Son of Man myth," a natural prophetic idea, as Maurnbrecher terms it. This Son of Man idea refers to the believers or new party, then to Jesus Himself—at least according to Johannes Weiss Jesus felt that He would be raised to Son of Man.

Now in this so-called Son of Man mythology there are sagas of dying and resurrection. So this is passed on to Jesus. We have here a Judaic and not Syriac origin, not Syrian Adonis, but an idea of the Jewish apocalypse. But the theory breaks down utterly at the historical point—"raised again on the third day." In spite of all efforts, "the third day," "after three days" proves New Testament historical faith. No effort can show that this three days was anywhere to be found except in the story of Jesus Christ.

Windisch declares after careful consideration that "pre-Christian story of this Son of Man lying three days in the grave is not possible of proof."[6]

With this agrees Dalmann, Words of Jesus, (Macmillan, p. 235), and Knowling's Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, (Lecture I and II. Conclusions).

Neither the Apocalypses of Enoch or Daniel have any such idea. In fact right at this point there is an absolute break-down. Apocalypses there were. General ideas of death and figures of quickening were included in them. But nowhere the "three days" which always accompanies the telling of the New Testament resurrection narrative.

Maurnbrecher fails then in explaining the life of Jesus. His apocalyptic Son of Man myth does not bear careful investigation. And even less in harmony with facts than that, is his replacing Christ's religious ideas with motives and ideas purely social.

In spite of this Maurnbrecher sees Christ cannot be resolved into mere myth. He acknowledges the genuineness of the "Acts of the Apostles." Agrees that Luke's gospel is early. Indeed he concedes that for him for whom Christianity is an actual re-

6 Windisch—Th. Rundschan June 1910, page 211.

lation of the soul with the living God, that for such an one (and shall we not say that this is Christianity—a relation of soul and Saviour) the historical beginnings of the religion (Christianity) must necessarily rest in a supernatural divine creature.

Yet he makes the first Christian Brotherhood to be built not in the life of a divine Saviour, but in the voluntary determinations of the desciples, and finally dissolves the historic life of Jesus into illusion and myth and romance. (In the "Religious Gespräch" at Berlin, "It, the Church, arose out of myth. Without myth we should not have had her.")[7] Thus our Christianity has arisen at the price of the liquidation of its chief asset—Jesus the Logos. So we may say that his view of the "Son of Man" myth, only after the death of Jesus, was centered upon Him, that the real secret of Christianity's origin lay in this afterthought of a deceased and forlorn peasantry, that Jesus Himself in all His efforts was moved peculiarly merely by economic considerations and that His life and death for Christianity, had, at the farthest, only a shadowy influential significance—all this, we say, is then as airy gauze, unable to meet historic conditions, incapable of giving even a partial solution of the true significance of Jesus Christ.

Next we come to the consideration of the position of K. Kautsky,[8] the socialist follower of Marx. He believes Jesus lived, but that His influence so far as the Christianity of to-day is concerned, is absolutely nil. This attitude is simpler and more negative than that of Kalthoff. Jesus' influence such as it was arose out of economic and social conditions then prevailing. These conditions necessitated the awakening of the Christian ideas. The ecclesiastical priesthood, the aristocratic plutocracy, the lazy and indifferent proletariat were each elements of preparation for a new organic social life.

Yet Kautsky seeks the initial grounds of Christianity not alone in these general movements, but more especially in the local economic and political conditions of Palestine itself. He sees then not four but five political parties. In addition to the well-to-do Sadducees, who sympathize with Rome, and the patriotic Pharisees who attempt a release from the yoke of Rome; in addi-

7 Jeremias, Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Feb. 1911, page 158.

8 K. Kautsky—Der Ursprung des christentums, 1908. K. Kautsky—Jesus der Rebel, 1910.

tion to the revolutionary Zealots who conducted a continuous predatory campaign against the government and the Essenes who maintained within themselves this communistic organization,—there was a fifth organization. It included something of the tendencies of both Zealot and Essene, but, and this was its vital feature, it had adaptive and propagating capacity, in such measure as to facilitate its expansion both in and out Palestine.

Kautsky insists on the proletarian character of the early Christian Church, claims it to have been a development from the lower class of society. He is satisfied he can find all the elements of such a social condition.

There is class hate (Luke 6:24-26), Woe unto you that are rich for you have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full now for you shall hunger.

There is communism (Acts 2:24, 4:32-37), And all they that believed were together and had all things in common.

There is a contempt for labor (Matt. 6:26-28), Behold the birds of the heavens, they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, and your heavenly Father feedeth them.

There is the destruction of the family (Luke 14:26), If any man cometh unto me and hateth not his own father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.

There is a future ideal state.

From this very inadequate exegesis, Kautsky goes on to base the origin of Christianity on the Church as a community. The core of the movement is not an individual at all, but a social body in a community group. If we ask what has Jesus to do with this? The answer is, so little that we may say nothing. True He lived. But he lived, Kautsky tells us, a rebel, a leader of revolutionary bands of banditti. On one of these raids He was seized, and by Roman magistrates crucified.

Kautsky, forgetting the Passion and almost all the body of Christ's teaching, quotes a few scattered passages in proof of his thought. (Luke 22:36 and Christ before Pilate).

The positions of Kautsky are really answered involuntarily. They break down of their own weight. His ground is only possible by his using the New Testament utterly without regard to any rules of critical thought. He arbitrarily includes and excludes its sections and books and paragraphs with no other pur-

pose than that of proving his premises. His plan therefore is absolutely without any claim to those who have regard for honest research. He excludes Paul's writings entirely, for they show the Christian life in relation to a legitimate government. But the revolutionary procedure of the zealots among the Jews was maintained up to the time of Hadrian, while Christians had been taught by their scriptures to live during all this time in peace with the State.[9]

Further, it is utterly inexplicable how a mere revolutionary teacher, such as Kautsky makes out Jesus to be, after He has been captured and executed, should continue to have such momentous force, such exhilirating influence as Jesus must have had. How could an unsuccessful leader become the head of a great movement, and how could any leader of so little and unimportant a body of men as the Zealots were obtain a commanding influence, first among Jewish secretaries such as Pharisees by whom they were bitterly antagonized, and then by the Gentile world, who knew little and cared less about all these external Jewish dissensions.

Moreover, there is utter failure to account for Christianity in that crucial point when the leader is crucified and as a consequence his followers disheartened. Here is a bridgeless chasm for the Kautsky school, and in the perplexity of it they are helpless.

With Kalthoff[10] we come to another socialistic view of a more extreme type, and yet one with much ground in common with those previously mentioned (i. e., of Maurnbrecher and Kautsky.) Like them he founds his conception of Jesus on the social idea. Indeed among recent writers he may be said to be the originator of this social interpretation of Jesus' life. On the other hand to him the Jesus of the New Testament has no existence. Him whom we know, in Whom we have believed, Him Kalthoff cannot find. He has finally reached the bottom.

Christianity was according to this view "purely a collective movement of the masses," entirely apart from the individualistic ideals of to-day's Christianity. Communistic as it was, the very

9 Windisch, Jesus ein Rebel? Neue Zeit., No. 28, Bk. I.

10 Das Christus Problem, Grundlinien zur Socialtheologie. 1903. Die Entstehung des Christentums, 1904. Was Wissen wir von Jesus, 1904.

idea of laying stress on any individual is out of harmony and inconsistent with the historical situation.

"Kalthoff stands on the basis of the so-called materialistic conception of history, whose nature consists in this; that it does not deduce the movements and incidents of a world historic sort from the activities of brilliantly endowed individuals, but rather interprets history from the class struggles of the several strata of society."[11]

But however much modern ideas tend towards the full recognition of society and social forces in the interpretation of the past, yet at the same time there never dares be denial of the existence of epoch making personalities nor a negation of their great weight in shaping history both religious and civil.

Therefore Kalthoff must build his denial of Jesus upon a more substantial basis than that of merely emphasizing the social structure at the expense of the individual. This he seeks to do, in a way perfectly consistent with, but at the same time to the despair of the average liberal school of theology. As a liberal, he too refuses credence to the New Testament writings upon which we base our picture of Christ. This he does not in part like most liberals—but in toto or just as far as necessary to carry out his own conception or to color the figure of Jesus according to his own taste. Since some of the Pauline letters have been by his liberal predecessors counted invalid, he deftly but valiantly brushes them all aside, thus carrying the liberal premises to their logical conclusion with a vengeance. His methods of work, applied to history, would deny the reality of such a man as Francis of Assisi of whom shortly after his death we have narratives of wonder works and fanciful miracles. Yet these do not affect our certainty as to Francis' existence.

He maintains also that John's Gospel is full of the ideas of New Platonism, a philosophic tendency of the third century after Christ. He forgets among other things that Irenaeus, who wrote about 180 his great work (Adversus Haeresias) against heresies, knows and uses John's Gospel very largely.[12] But like Haeckel, Kalthoff is not bothered by a little thing like historical accuracy.

11 Prof. Walter, Breslau, Christentum ohne Christus.

12 Irenaeus, Against Heresies, Book 1-5, John 1:1-2. Book 1-5, John 1:14. Book 1-5, John 1:5. Book 1-5, John 1:3-4 and scores of others.

What he is pleased to leave of the New Testament, he interprets allegorically.

Peter is not a person, but the brotherhood of Rome.

Christ is not a person, but the Christian Church brotherhood. All early writings that absolutely necessitate a recognition of Jesus the individual, he simply rejects, as for instance the letters of Ignatius. In such cases as they refer to Jesus he calls the references interpolations. In such cases as he needs Ignatius' help he quotes him with insistence.

But one asks in astonishment how could this idea of Christ utterly apart from any personal Christ have wrought itself into the strong early days of the Church's life, and then, stranger yet, having been inwrought how did the Church change to its idea of the personal Christ—and all the time no one know of it—no hue and cry be raised about it. No, Kalthoff's ideas are allegory sure enough. He fails in historical, critical interpretation.[13] (Jeremias).

No merely poetic legendary mythical literature, such as Kalthoff imagines the New Testament to be, can ever possibly meet the needs of a great new religious movement with a force which dominates in a short time the whole world both in the heart and in the State. Jewish Messianism, state philosophy, and social communism do not combine with the fervency necessary to explain a Christianity outside of Christ. So that no more here than at the hand of Kautsky do we find that the social solution of the life of Jesus is adequate to explain the initial strength which inhered in the conquering Christian circles of the very early centuries of the era which we call—and do well to call—the era of Christ.

We now turn from the denial of Jesus on social grounds to that same denial on the grounds of Oriental myth. This view is represented and championed by Prof. Jensen the Assyriologist.[14] Professor Jensen characterizes the work of the Evangelists as merely a Judaistic reconstruction of the sagas of Babylonia. He finds the root of our Gospels specially in the poetic Epic of "Gil-

13 Jeremias, N. T. Zeitschrift, Feb. 1911.

14 Peter Christian Albrecht Jensen of Marburg, whose chief work is in Assyriology and Hittite inscriptions. See also Fr. Stendel—"Im Kampf um die Christusmythe," 1910 für die Existenz des Menschen Jesus.

gamesch."[15] This epic, whose text is from the seventh century B. C., was given out by the Assyrian king Sardonapolis. It has been much written about. In it we have the core of Jensen's myth idea, of the origin of Christianity without Christ. Its general content is as follows.[16]

The hero of the poem is the demigod Gilgamesch. He is three-fourths God, one-fourth man. As a ruler, he is Lord of the city of Erech and despotic in the exercise of his power. He builds for protection a wall about his city and in so doing compels the young men of the town to toil like serfs. Their wives and sweethearts grieve at this and beg the Goddess Aruru, while Gilgamesch's attention is elsewhere directed, to create other beings of power and nature equal to his. This she does, making Eabini out of the earth.

Eabini has long shaggy hair, and at first refuses association with men—remaining with the animals. He lives on grass and herbs, a wilderness life. In the meantime he is enticed by a bashful maiden to come with her into the city. Thereafter the animals fear him and shun him and flee before him. But already Gilgamesch has seen in dreams, now of a star, again of a man, the Host of the Lord, who is stronger than he. These dreams presage the coming of Eabini. Thereupon Eabini enters the city and Gilgamesch and he become friends. Then occasions arise calling for a series of heroic fabled acts, like those of Achilles or Hercules if you please. (First) they make a crusade against the Tyrant Chumbales whose task it has been to protect the forest of cedar—the home of the gods. They bring Chumbales' head back to Erech a trophy of victory. According to the epic, Eabini seems now to return to the forest. Then the Sun God calls to him telling him that his feet will be blessed by the kings of the earth. Eabini leaves the desert, comes again to Gilgamesch, the godless Ischtan loves him but he fears her love, because it has wrought sorrow in her former lovers. In her rage she causes a god to create a heavenly dragon who shall conquer the heroes. But again Gilgamesch and Eabini overcome their adversary.

But at this juncture the victorious career of these demigods

15 Die Gilgamesch Epos in der Weltliterature, 1906, Jensen.

16 See Prof. Walter Breslau—Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung, Christentum ohne Christus, Dec. 2. 1910.

seems to end. Eabini falls into a deep sleep from which he does not again awake. Gilgamesch is in heavy sorrow—first because of the death of his friend and farther because this death seems to impend also over him. He is uncertain of a continued immortality in life. So he seeks for a means to escape this death—and this, how to escape death, is doubtless the purpose and purport of the whole epic.

Gilgamesch seeks help of the Xisuthros, from whom he learns that he has attained immortal life in that he is to be translated among the gods. But though translated he yet must divinely attain the height by his own efforts. The way thereto is not a light or easy one. It is full of dangers and snares. Gilgamesch meets first the scorpion man, part man, part dragon. It guards the gateway to the sun. The dragon will not permit Gilgamesch's passage, yet he wins his way through. He comes to the Goddess Siduri and asks the further way's direction. She tells him of a boatman who can bring him there, but at the same time informs him that he cannot attain thereto, cannot reach his desire for the gods have decreed it that the fate of man is death. Yet Gilgamesch with his boatman sails to escape this death—from east to west, till he comes to the very waters of death itself. In the breakers and roaring surf Gilgamesch tears the mast out of the boat to save himself.

Again he comes to Xisuthros and begs for knowledge of how he may attain immortality. But Xisuthros too tells him it has been appointed man once to die. He, however, inquires of Xisuthuros how he, Xisuthuros, has attained immortality. Then it is that Xisuthuros tells him the Babylonian story of the flood. The gods had determined to obliterate man altogether, but he had built a ship for himself and saved himself, family and the beasts.

The gods, sorry for their action, glad that life had escaped, showed their gratitude to Xisuthuros by setting him among the gods. But yet that does not help Gilgamesch. Xisuthuros tells him to find a certain bitter weed which would enable him to reach home safely, but a serpent robs him of it. Saddened, at last Gilgamesch finds himself again, still under the fear of death, at his home city of Erech. And the epic ends by Gilgamesch, who now sees no deliverance from death, calling up his friend Eabini and inquiring of him of his life in the kingdom of the

dead. Thus it seems that the struggle for life out of death is merged into a plaint over the dead.

In this Babylonian Homerian myth Jensen seeks to find the beginnings of our Gospel of the Son of God. It would surely be pathetic if it were not tragic.

By dint of ingenuity he seeks to find a series of parallels between Epic and Gospel.[17]

At first Eabini is created by a miracle. John miraculously announced by an angel.

Eabini is a dweller in the wilderness and has shaggy hair. John Baptist lives in the wilderness and has hair unshorn.

Eabini like the wild beasts lives on herbs and the products of the wild. John on grasshoppers and wild honey.

Gilgamesch has portentous dreams of some one to come stronger than he, which is fulfilled by Eabini's coming to him. John foretells Jesus' coming to him, who must increase as he must decrease and Jesus Himself does appear to him as the Lamb of God.

Eabini and John both flee into the wilderness.

The Sun God from heaven tells Eabini in the desert of better food. The Devil takes Jesus up into the high mountains and speaks to Him of bread "from these stones."

There are further parallels, but this is sufficient to indicate Jensen's supposed Gospel origin. He also indicates a sort of similarity between Xisuthuros and Jesus in connection with a kind of parallelism in Xisuthuros' life to the episode of the stilling of the tempest in the Sea of Galilee.[18]

Here then is this old Babylonish seventh century B. C. legend Jensen seeks for clay to make gospel brick. Let it be said at once he is making brick without straw.

Now if we take up these supposed parallelisms and examine them critically it is only to see them disappear.

There is lamentable confusion in the personal parallelism. Jesus is now Eabini and then He is Xisuthuros. John is first Eabini, then he becomes Gilgamesch, later suffering under Herod he dies as Eabini.

Take the uncited parallel of the stilling of the temepst and its

17 P. Jensen—Moses, Jesus, Paulus, drei Variantes des Babylonischen Gottmenschen-Gilgamesch, 1909, pages 27-30.

18 P. Jensen—Moses, Paulus, und Jesus"—pages 29 and 30.

following incidents, Jesus is Gilgamesch and Xisuthuros absolutely without rule or order.

Gilgamesch again in different parts of this story represents the rich man in hell, and the rich young ruler, the disciples, Peter and Christ. Thus confusion and confusion only, comes of any attempt to follow any parallelism with regard to the persons of the epos.

Now turning from persons to events, we arrive at a confusion worse confounded in pursuing the alleged parallelism. John is identified with Eabini because of a supposed likeness to their birth, though otherwise there is not a single inner characteristic in common. Did they both live in the wilderness—yet was this not common in the East and not a thing upon which to base an identification any more than nowadays it would be a mark to identification of two persons to say that they both lived in a brick house. John was a prophet—Eabini anything but that. John reproves Herod for Herodias' sake—Gilgamesch, who here takes the place of Eabini, reproves the Goddess Ischtus. How utterly absurd is the comparison drawn.

Take the case of the temptation parallelism. With Jesus there is the turning aside from the lesser good that He may consecrate the higher motive—His bread and meat is to do the will of Him who sent Him. But as for Eabini when his temptation comes, he is one with the beasts and lured by a common woman sent to tempt him, he follows her into the city—yielding to the lower nature.

These utter inconsistencies, Jensen himself is obliged to recognize but with the irrevocableness of the man whose mind is made up he tries to find his way out by claiming that the Gilgamesch epic is just the starting point and source of the Gospel story of Christ and also of the Old Testament narratives. Everywhere he finds two characters like Abraham and God, Moses and Aaron, Elijah and Elisha. And wherever two names are together he is quite excited over a re-discovery of his friends Gilgamesch and Eabini. So where there are discrepancies he simply says time has got the sharp personal elements of Gilgamesch and Eabini mixed. It is as though Gilgamesch has acquired an eye of Eabini, a tooth of Xisuthuros. And Eabini has won the ability to be now Gilgamesch, now Xisuthuros, now both. (You recall the strange case of Mr. Jekyl and Dr. Hyde). In view of these ab-

surdities, students of Jensen's scheme agree that he fails in consistently carrying through the Gilgamesch epic, any Gospel character or event at all. There is no logical sequence or consequential order of the Gospel narratives and the Gilgamesch epic. It is just because there is no organic relation that Jensen has to make out his character a Jesus by combining three or four of his mythical persons into one in order to come any way within the scope of reason near to the Gospel story. But can we not see that by such a process we can prove that Jesus was Gilgamesch or Eabini or Xisuthuros at our pleasure, and that which proves too much, as logicians tell us proves nothing at all. I am sure therefore that we dare say that Jensen's house is a house of cards.

Besides this—and even beyond it in fatality to Jensen's case, in order to make any sort of case at all he has to make huge gaps in both Gospel and Epic, in forming his parallelism. He identified the two only by the happy and hardy expedient of dropping out always and anywhere, characteristics not desired and which might be awkward. Jesus, as we know Him, is not in the Babylonian tale, at all. None of his teachings, none of his unified oneness with God, none of his spiritual heights, is there.

How about Gilgamesch's effort to overcome death? The purpose of the epic. There is no answer—but submission. The Greek stoics answer, that is all. In the Gilgamesch epic as we have it there is no resurrection. The hinge of Christian history is thus absent. The parallelisms, whatever they may seem to be, have no core, no objective purpose, no centrality of motive, no consequential organic oneness, that which is the heart and soul of Christianity is not in Jensen's myth at all. Hence we register here a collossal failure. In no respect does Jensen's hypothesis as a theory to explain the origin of the Gospel without reference to a historical Jesus, seem to have any validity.[19] We may pass from Jensen by the assertion that the origin of Christianity is not to be understood as a mere solution of a historical problem.

We advance now and finally to the man who most of all has in the past months been in the public eye when the life of Jesus Christ has been under consideration. This man is Arthur Drews,

19 Case—American Journal of Theology, Jan. 1911.

a professor of philosophy in the technical Hochschule at Karlsruhe.[20]

It was more than anyone else's, his denial of Jesus Christ that moved the passionate popular assemblages held last summer all over Germany in which the Christian populace, of all shades of theological view, poured out a flood of undreamed of enthusiasm in testimonial to their unchanged and unchanging faith in the life of Jesus Christ and the life to come made possible only by Him.

Like Kalthoff, he refuses to accept Jesus Christ as a historical character. But his grounds are not sociological, but literary-historical. In this he is more on Jensen's ground.

He belongs to the "religionsgeschichtliche school" whose purpose in recent years has been to show that Christianity like other religions had its origin as a natural development, entirely within the range of the ordinary processes of growth and life. Christianity is thus a religion, that is one made up of an admixture of Jewish and Oriental elements.

Drews, simply following out this line of argument, takes a step in advance—a step which his predecessors were either not willing or not able to do. He does not permit the mythical idea to enter into his argument merely as an incidental support. But he makes it the very center of his viewpoint. He however gets his myth from the Jews rather than the Orient.

In brief, he declares that very early, before New Testament times, there was among Jewish sects a so-called Jesus-God and cult reaching as far back as Joshua of the Old Testament, and to this in the making of the Jesus of the Gospels there is added Jewish apocalyptic and heathen myth ideas.

The gospels thus do not contain the history of an actual person, but are merely the narrative of a myth—a Jesus made up out of Old Testament prophets and from variously wrought in and wrought out mythical conceptions. Paul himself, who is the pre-eminent witness for Christianity, really knows nothing of an historical Jesus. The incarnate God of whom he spoke is merely this Jewish-Oriental cult-god etherealized and ethicised by Paul himself. The elements which gathered about this Jesus in the early Christian community, such as Baptism and the

20 Die Christus Myths, 3d ed. 1910. Hat Jesus gelebt, Berliner Religionsgespräch 1910.

Lord's Supper, the crucifixion and the resurrection are all, according to this view, from pre-Christian symbolism.[21]

In the first chapter of his book on "Der Vorchristliche Jesus," that is the Jesus who was before the Jesus of the gospels, Christ is made out to be the cult-god of an early Jewish sect. And we have the bald assertion that before our era, that is before Christ, there were Jesus worshippers. This is a daring statement. One would think the proof would be specially strong. But what we have is not a rich clover field of fact, but a sparse and struggling growth with here and there a dirty, toughened, tooth-worn blade. Let us see. We find three exhibits offered in evidence for this early use of the name "Jesus."

These are extracts respectively from Hippolytus,[22], Epiphanius and from an early Paris magic papyrus.

Hyppolytus in the beginning of the third century A. D., quotes a hymn[23] of the "Nassini" which seeks to explain their gnostic system. In this hymn we have a line, "But Jesus said, Father, behold, a strife of ills across the earth. On this account, oh Father, send me.....and secrets of the saintly faith, styled 'gnosis,' I'll impart." Drews claims this reference as probably pre-Christian.

But first "The Philosophumes or Refutations of Heresies" was only discovered in 1842 at Mt. Athos—men are not yet certain even that it is by Hyppolytus. Some say Origen is the author. "The text of the hymn quoted is very corrupt."[24] Besides Hyppolytus cites this "Nassini" sect as a Christian sect, and it is the nature of so-called Christian gnostics that "they use old Babylonian mythologies and apply them to the historical person of Jesus, thus taking ancient pre-Christian myths and fitting them into the lives of the persons who are known through the New Testament."[25]

In the matter of the Paris Papyrus of magic Drews quotes two passages, the second and chief of which reads: "ὀρκιζω σε κατα

21 Berliner Religionsgesprach, Hat Jesus gelebt, 1910.

22 Realencyclopedie, Vol. 14, article Ophiten—R. Liechtenahn. See page 410 die Erlösung.

23 Hippolytus Refutation of Heresies, Book V, Chapt. 5.

24 Bunsen, I, 36.

25 Windnisch, der Geschichtliche Jesus, p. 166, Th. R. March 1910.

του θεου των Εβραίων Ιησου,"[26] (I put you on oath by the God of the Hebrews, Jesus).

Now is this formula pre-Christian? It seems absolutely without question not to be. This is the opinion of both Harnack and Windisch neither of whom can be accused of shying from any negative results which their acceptance of the early age of this wonder-working magic document might demand.

The fragment from which the lines are taken is preserved in the Bibliothque National in Paris and was written about the third century,[27] that is at a post-Christian date and under Christian influences.[28] This fragment gives us an illustration of the books of magic with which Paul met at Ephesus. It is after Paul's time and contains anti-Christian spells and sorceries with an admixture of Christian thoughts and ideas.[29]

The name of Jesus is thus, according to every probability, dragged into an old magic formula to give it special strength. So it is a recognition of the growing power of Christ in the early Church. (Remember the case of Elymas and Simon the Sorcerer). "The name of Jesus in this fragment," says Deissmann, "dare scarcely be considered old. It is apparently introduced by a heathen. Neither a Christian nor certainly a Jew would call Jesus the God of the Hebrews."[30]

The conclusion borne out by the examination is that it is a heathen formula of dubious date in regard to its magical part, but itself written down in its present form not earlier than the third century. It is on such slender threads as these that decision is sought for so stupendous a reversal of history.

Special weight is attached by Drews to his other proof, that from Epiphanius, the church father who lived in the fourth century. Epiphanius speaks of a sect called Ιεσσαιοι that this sect afterwards took the name Ναζοραιοι but that this earlier name is to be derived from "Jesus" and that this sect existed long before Christ.[31] Now first Epiphanius seems doubtful as to who these Ιεσσαιοι really were, identifying them now with the Therapeutae of Philo and again with the false Christians. But in neither

26 Lines 3019-20, Book II, Quoted by Deissmann.
27 Deissmann, Licht vom Osten, page 180.
28 Windisch, der Geschichliche Jesus, p. 186, March 1910 Th. R.
29 Deissmann.
30 Deissmann, page 186, Note 14.
31 Epiphanius Haereceis, 29-6.

case do we find a pre-Christian Jesus cult. For, in the first place, the name Ιεσσαιοι is to be derived not from Ιησους but from Ιεσσαι [32] Secondly, the Nazaraioi or Nasarioi can only be connected with the Christians by a dubious philological process, as for instance that Nazarite-watchman-keeper-Savior-Jesus. But Epiphanius makes no such statement. In fact he himself attaches the name Nazarite to the village of Nazareth, which early and uniform tradition makes the home of Jesus. And Epiphanius distinguishes between two forms of the word Nazarine. When sifted down, what he really says is this—"that the known Jewish Christian sect, the Ναζοραιοι called themselves originally Ιεσσαιοι before the name Christian was taken up;" but that the Ιεσσαιοι were consequently before the time of Christ, Epiphanius does not at all affirm. What he does say is this, that another sect than the above-named Ναζοραιοι called themselves Ναζαραιοι and that these existed already before Christ."[33] With this distinction Epiphanius really says quite the reverse of what Drews tries to read into him.

Third, a further proof that the two preceding deductions I have just made are correct, that is that Epiphanius does not affirm nor intend to affirm a Jesus cult antidating the Jesus of the Gospels, is this: as a Christian he evidently could not have taken such a position annihilating all his work, specially as he was characterized by the strictest orthodoxy and the most earnest piety.[34]

Thus a careful insight into these three pieces of documentary evidences—all the positive and direct proof which Drews presents—shows their utter inadequacy to make his case. His thesis so far as this his direct evidence is concerned thus breaks down completely.

There is also, however, other circumstantial evidence alleged which we will do well to look into. Assumptions drawn from the hazy and gauzy mists of the past and clad in the grotesque and sportive forms of his own inventive ecstatic and superexuberant fancy. Let us see!

It is supposed that along with the stern monotheism of the

32 Windisch, Der Geschicht Jesus, Tr. R. p. 166.

33 Christentum ohne Christus—Walter Breslau—Alle. Kirch. Zeitung, Dec. 16, 1910.

34 Epiphanius, art. Realencyklopedie, Bonwetch, vol. 5, p. 418.

main tribes of the Jews there were in existence Jewish sects who at the same time worshipped a pre-gospel Jesus. This Jesus cult was gradually introduced and built up from Greek and Oriental religious influence which had gradually penetrated the hard shell of Hebrew faith and custom.

In answer to this it may be said at once that isolation is one of the very fundamentals of Jewish religious history. Whatever else may be said of them, it remains that the Hebrews carried a persistent, stubborn and growing aloofness from Polytheism and adherence to Monotheism. "The Lord their God is one God"—so not only does the whole trend and color of Jewish history give no basis for this supposed existing Jesus cult, but when carefully examined the definite testimony for such cult is as usual most hazy and unsatisfactory. Jewish literature is silent about any such thing. It is unaware of the Jesus cult.

Indeed Drews only instances one or two such sects, though he claims them to have been "numberless." The name "Jesus" is connected for instance with the θεραπευτης mentioned by Philo, because forsooth— θεραπευτης means leader—while Jesus is deliverer, savior. It is in this sort of way the Therapeutae are shown to be Jesus worshippers. The wish is father to the thought.

Typical of this is the method of handling the Symbol of the Lord. The Gospel "Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world" is presumptuously identified with Arios (the bull). Agnus Dei, Lamb of God, originally was but Agnus Deus, the Lamb-God.[35] Drews fails entirely to note that Agnus Dei is a mere translation of the original Greek ἀμνος του θεου. But there is no relation at all between Agni, a cult, i. e., Agni the proper name, and ἀμνος from which our Agnus comes, simply because it is the translation of ἀμνος—not the transliteration.

Joseph and Mary are treated in similar mythical way. Joseph is a carpenter that is an artificer like Kinyrac the father of Adonis and Vulcan the father of Mercury.[36] Mary is merged in a similar way into Maya the mother or Agnis or Mihe the mother of Mithris or Maya the mother of Adonis. As you will understand no proof is given or attempted for such bold recon-

35 Christus Myth, pages 99-103.

36 Christus Myth, page 75.

structions—nothing but the cleverness of the surmise which, clearly subjective, is supposed to have convincing force.

In this working out of history into mythical cult, John Baptist is denied as a historical personality and of course his preaching and baptism in the wilderness of Judea vanishes as a dream. True Josephus has a very minute, interesting and for his purpose pertinent notice of "John that was called the Baptist" and "who was sent a prisoner out of Herod's suspicious temper to Maechaerus, the castle I have before mentioned, and was there put to death."[37] Drews simply sets the passage aside denying its authenticity. Why? Not because there is any such evidence, but because according to his theory it must not be there.

John Baptist is only the Babylonian god Oannes. Yet even the liberal critical theologians have to deny such high-handed putting away of John Baptist. For aside from Josephus, the whole New Testament incidental later narratives of John shows him not to have been an invention but out of a real segment of Jewish life.

As illustration take the (Luke 7:18) disciples of John visiting Jesus, his answer, their struggles, John's own self-obliteration. All are incidents which in no wise at the time were helps to a popular acceptance of the work of Jesus—incidents which therefore are there because they are historical—and are not therefore to be eliminated.

Coming now to Jesus' suffering and death on the cross, Drews merges these gospel facts with supposed extra-canonical similar ideas, until the gospel fact of the cross, "If I be lifted up will draw all men unto me," is totally submerged in its mythical pre-Christian correlates. It is argued that the Suffering Messiah is not an exclusively Christian idea, but was Jewish already previously and of heathen origin; and that the cross before Christianity had found its religious symbolization as the way of the martyr.[38]

Now that nature myths of death and resurrection, typifying winter and summer, are characteristics of the Orient and even of Greek thought no one questions. But that these geographically isolated and ethically strange and religiously divergent local

37 Josephus, Antiquities, Book 18, Chapt. 5:2.

38 Christus Myth, pages 103 ff.

nature myths could without any other centralizing force have become the dominant, central, focal, masterful force of Christianity which it has become, is unthinkable to anyone who balances his judgment by just scales and weights.

The early disciples did not expect Jesus' death, least of all on the cross. They had to be told it again and again[39] and were dull in the hearing and dazed in their experience of it.[40] They were totally unlike in their reticence and unbelief to those whom Drews tells us of, who elected the heathen ideals to put them together in the person of Jesus. Mark, Matthew, Luke or John give no pictures at all like his of the faith of these disciples. And as for the cross, it later true enough became the Christian's sign of triumph. (In hoc signo vinces. Constantine.) But it was at first an offense, to Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolishness. Perhaps it had application in other religious symbols, but this has nothing at all to do with disallowing the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. It would be quite as absurd to deny the recent coronation of George V of England because of doubt as to the historical genuineness of the ancient black stone in the old wooden chair on which the kings of England sit when crowned, because one cannot prove that this stone was really, as the legend has it, the very stone used by Jacob for a pillow when in Padan Aram he dreamed and wrestled with God. In short, whatever history duly examined into may tell us as to the pre-Christian reverential use of the cross, it can tell us nothing to eliminate the cross of Christ as a fact first of Jerusalem history and only afterwards of religious power and conquest.

The name "Jesus" itself is exploited by Drews in an effort to show a pre-Christian prototype. We have shown his method before, a method of pure fancifulness without scientific basis. He lets his imagination run riot with all the possible similarities of sounds in the various languages.

Jesus is thus Joshua. Both names are alike in sound and meaning. Joshua a cult god leads his people to the land of milk and honey, equals the Milky Way. Jesus and Joshua are equivalent to the Greek Jason. Jesus has His twelve disciples, Joshua his twelve tribes, and Jason his twelve eunuchs, all these were

39 Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32.
40 Luke 24:25.

different idealizations of the twelve signs of the Zodiac. Isn't this argument with a vengeance? For of course there is no whit of evidence of a Joshua-cult among the early tribes, and the names Joshua, Jason, Jesus were so common that Josephus himself refers to not less than twenty persons called Jesus.[41] One might really just as logically relate all the 'Hans' in Deutschland with all the Hansens in Norway, or if you please affirm that President Lincoln was a Jew and Mr. Roosevelt a Greek, for wasn't the former's name Abraham, and that of the latter Theodore?

With this sort of reasoning, or rather lack of it, one gets nowhere at all. And one is not surprised that numbers of Prof. Drews' compatriots refer quite often to the fact that he is no "fachman" in much of the ground he covers. That he has no skilled knowledge of that which he affirms.[42]

In the meantime how does Drews handle the Gospels. Briefly speaking and characteristically, one can say he sets the Gospels very lightly aside. He claims them all fictions. He calls the effort to critically determine their content a "horrible fiasco." To tell the truth he gives quite a shock to the liberals by taking their own positions, quoting their own arguments and then showing how logic leads to shooting the rapids and even going over the whirlpool.

But the whole liberal camp are shocked at this bold use of their weapons—and I incline to think some of them will waken up to the perilous place they hold.

Windisch, Wernle,[43] Holtzmann,[44] Julicher,[45] Von Soden,[46] Weiss[47] and Weinel[48] all deny with scorn that liberalism leads to any such conclusions. And perhaps they are right. Yet Drews uses their concessions without mercy and often draws blood. Though to be sure not gospel blood.

To illustrate, Windisch, a liberal, but reverential and who can ill brook the destructive work of Drews, must agree that there

41 Weinel—Ist das Liberale Jesusbild widerligt, 1911.
42 He is prof. of philosophy in Karlsruhe.
43 P. Wernle—Wider Modern Skepis fur der Glauben an Jesus.
44 H. Holtzmann—Paulus als zeuge wider die Christusmyth.
45 A. Julicher—Hat Jesus gelebt.
46 H. Von Soden—Hat Jesus gelebt.
47 J. Weiss—Jesus Von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte.
48 Ist das liberale Jesusbild Widerligt—H. Weinel.

are legendary sections in the New Testament, but he draws the line on Drews' calling these "really numberless." Thus between Drews and these men there has arisen considerable heat. For the first time some of them have been brought to a sudden and heretofore undreamed of consciousness of the fateful if not fated possibilities of their position.

To be sure Drews has handled the gospel texts with perfect naivete and utter disregard to a real scholarly understanding of the text. Yet the philologist Wendland declares that "whoever is not able to find individual religious life in the Synoptic basis, he is incompetent of historical research in this province."[49] And Windisch insists that in all the philological points Drews tries to make against Christ "not a single ground has been found against the historicity of Jesus." "We have no ground to mistrust the Evangelical tradition in this way."[50]

But to Drews the Gospels contain only the myth of the God-Man Jesus, wrapped up in historical forms taken from Old Testament prophets and also heathen contemporaneous cults. To this is added poem and legend. This is his picture. Setting aside the text, Drews has ready to replace it a theory as wild as it is baseless: Paul has already become a power with his new teaching. The Jewish-Christian Adonis worshippers grow jealous of his success, specially his freedom from the law. To meet and rival him and vanquish him, they determine to show he doesn't know Jesus at all. Hence they build up a new Jesus Christ, personifying an ideal and attaching to it all sorts of legend and poem. And this is how we get Jesus.

This requires no rejoiner. It falls of its own weight over against "In the beginning was God and the Word was God." So also does Drews' assertion that "In the gospels we are not dealing with a deified man but rather with an anthropomorphized God."[51] For undoubtedly the chief difficulty of the propagators and missionaries for early Christianity was not an unwillingness or disinclination to believe that a God could or had become man (See Warneck), but that a man, as they thought like others whose brethren they knew, whose reputed father was a neighbor of theirs, that such an one—could be—was God, that the Jew,

49 Quoted by Walter Breslau, Allg. Zeitung, Dec. 16, 1910.
50 Theo. May 1910, p. 178.
51 Christus Mythe, p. 210.

was Son of Man, Son of David and Son of God.[52] At least this is the natural process of the growth of Christianity in its very feeble beginnings. It works out from the active person of Jesus. He compels the slack and tardy acceptance of Himself to grow into fealty and love, sheerly out of what he was and became to the band of disciples and not at all because they expected Him as God.

Paul is handled with the same slight-of-hand and legerdemain as were the Gospels. Paul according to Drews knows no historical Jesus. He is acquainted with no human-factual Jesus, but only with an ideal man, a heavenly god-man by which he means to express only the ideal totality of our humanity's manhood.[53]

Paul's Jesus was merely the God of a heathen cult. The matter of the last supper (I Cor. 11:23) is set aside as an early interpolation; the appearances of the resurrected Christ become a mere ecstatic experience, (I Cor. 15:3). The "brothers" of the Lord (Gal. 1:19) are not kin but the expression of a new fraternal relationship. The "Words of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 20:35) are personifications only.

Yet though he denies the validity of all these for him unhandy passages, he yet builds a whole theology out of Paul's teaching and life, using such parts as suit his theory. In this picking and choosing there is no rule nor principle by which he accepts the one and rejects the other. It is all a matter of individual choice and taste, with not even the gravity of our childhood methods of determining our future riches or profession by the process of naming our buttons "rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief." So we learn that Paul has no occasion for nor real interest in the life of Jesus. His doctrine depends upon the so-called heavenly Christ on whom he believed before he believed on Jesus (the cult Jesus) and on whom and not on the real Jesus he built his Christ-mythology.

If we ask how Paul's gospel was born, or rather how he was born into it, we are told that Adonis is the basis of it. We know from our Greek mythology how Adonis, beloved by Aphrodite, died of a wound. From his blood sprang the Anemone. Aphrodite's

52 See American Journal of Theology, Jan. 1911, art. Historicity of Jesus. S. J. Case.

53 Christusmythe, p. 143.

grief was so great that the gods of the lower world permitted him to spend six months of each year with her on the earth. So sprang up the Adonis worship of Phoenician origin and in all probability associated with the idea of the revival of nature after the death of the winter.

Tarsus was a metropolitan education center. Here Paul learned of this Adonis cult which had in the meantime been worked over by some Jews, and spiritualized and incorporated into Jewish thought.

First in Antioch, (Disciples were called Christians first in Antioch) the effort was made to introduce this new worship. Paul first opposed it. Then suddenly it came to him that this Adonis idea represented the Messiah, who was therefore their Lord. The resurrection idea was thus ready at hand. Could it not be, thought Paul, that the Messiah whom the Jwes expected on the ground of human righteousness had already come and won salvation for men. This idea he grasped through the Adonis myth and Hebrew prophecy and once having this thought Christianity was born and the myth might go.

Surely it is bizarre enough, this new basis for Paul and Christ and Christianity. One would think Paul would tell us something of this Adonis cult, something of how the idea sprang into his mind, who was this Messiah, when and how did he appear, how did he accomplish the redemption. Yet we who read Paul's letters find nothing of all this. To refresh my mind as to Adonis, I have to turn to a classic mythology, not to a concordance of the New Testament.

How can such unheard of conceptions be the occasion of Christianity? Here is a deeply religious Jew Paul, he is angered at the Jewish heathenish myth, but all at once he adopts it with enthusiasm, the holy Messiah, the divine promise of the prophets comes, has come in the type of a heathen legend. He, keen, cultured religionist, accepts without a question. He gives his life to an hallucination. He tells his fellow-countrymen our Messiah is come. Of course not really but just the idea. If this is anything, this is Plato and not Paul. It may be the Platonic idea, it is not the "I know whom I have believed" of Paul.

But Paul does know Christ. There is no time to discuss this feature here. Recent discussion fully satisfied the unity of Jesus Christ and Paul. It is no longer an open question whether or

not Paul is true to the life and teaching of Christ. Recent works both exact and scholarly have set forever at rest the supposed alienation of Paul and Christ. Knowling,[54] Weiss,[55] Julicher[56] and Kaftan have demonstrated without possibilities of contradiction that the Apostle Paul preached and lived in the transcendal Christ, because he knew and understood the Jesus of Judea and Man of Galilee.

Paul's pre-existent Son of God has personal characteristics which can be derived neither from Greek mythology nor from the Logos idea of Philo, but which have their origin out of the historical portrait of the Gospels."[57]

Many features of Paul's Christ, such as his poverty,[58] his disciples, [59] his exaltation,[60] have no counterpart at all in the Adonis fiction. And on the other hand many Adonis features find no parallel in the life of Jesus. These lacks of similarity helps us see the absurdity of the assumptions.

The death of Christ is central with Paul. It is the accentuated thing—we preach Christ and Him crucified. And this, as a historical event. This God as a fact and not an idea is the very ground of Paul's new faith, and activity.

Drews fails here to catch the distinction between Jewish and Greek thinking. Philosophical speculation in the abstract is the characteristic of Greek thought, but the Jew on the contrary works out all his prophecy and philosophy as far as he has philosophy in connection with a personality of history.[61]

No, we cannot make over Paul, the stern monotheist, into a Greek pantheist, even at the will of a Carlsruhe professor. So we are brought to the fixed conclusion, as far as Paul is concerned, that when a Jew brought the message, the Messiah is come, he must have had a historical person in whom this his faith was grounded. The historical Jesus played the greatest possible role with Paul. In His life and His death were the

54 The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ—R. J. Knowling, 1909.
55 Paulus und Jesus—J. Weiss, 1909.
56 Paulus und Jesus—A. Julicher, 1907.
57 Paulus und Jesus—Weiss, p. 15.
58 2 Cor. 8:9.
59 Gal. 1:18.
60 Phil. 2:9.
61 Windisch—Theol. May 1910, p. 172.

begetters of the faith. This was the Messiah, He is called Jesus, was crucified because He must heal the sins of men.[62]

So that all in all Drews' Christusmyth seems itself a myth, that is a study by one who was not equipped to do what he purposed to do, and who has not done it. Prof. Gunkel says that whoever uses Old Testament citations as does Drews is lacking in the fundamentals. "The comparisons of the names Jesus and Joshua, he continues, which build a marked feature of Drews' system is sheer nonsense. The word Jesus contains a confession of the worship of Jehovah and is not the name of a cult god Joshua. You talk, Prof. Drews, about things you do not understand. Joshua was no cult god, nor was Jesus. The whole older Christianity believed on Jesus. It is high time for you, Prof. Drews, to about face and permit yourself to be taught by men who have learned."[63] These were sharp words of Gunkel—but they seem to have been deservedly applied.

Now let us note the grounds which of necessity demand an acknowledgement of the historical person of Jesus.

We may pass by with a mere mention, the reference of Suetonius, private secretary of Hadrian (about 120 A. D.) in his biography of the Emperor Claudius, the reference of Tacitus (A. D. 110)[64] who speaks of "Christ who under the Emperor Tiberius was executed by Pontius Pilate." I pass by the references to Christ in Josephus[65] at least one of which bears strong marks of authenticity. Justin Martyr (160) in his dialog with Trypho the Jew enters into an involved and discursive discussion of Christ. But of the Jews one does not expect much mention of Jesus, because of their previous censorship of all things Christian. There are also inscriptions at Pompeii pointing to Jesus. In fact Jew and Gentile alike take His person for granted. How did Paul imbibe his enthusiastic faith? Surely not from his own hallucination, but from the facts of Jesus' life and death, and most glorious resurrection.

In the beginning some Jewish Christians denied Paul's apostolicity—why? Because he was not eye-witness of the life of

62 Windisch—Theol. May 1910, p. 175.
63 Prof. D. Gunkel— at the Darmstadt Monistenbund Besprechung. Allg. Zeitung, April 29, 1910.
64 Annalles, 15, 44.
65 Antiquities 18-3-3. See also Schürer Part I, Vol. 2, Antiq. 20-9-1.

Jesus. Now if they had simply invented Jesus, how easily Paul could have turned the tables on them, and he would have done it too, just as he withstood Peter to his face. He would have called them, and rightly so, deceivers and liars. For they objected to him because he had not seen a person who existed only in their imaginations.

On the contrary, he too, claims to have seen Him "who was the first born of many brethren." And this makes his consistent claim to the Apostolate. But did they really deceive him and all the world, these poor unlettered Jews. For shortly we find him too, speaking not only of the exalted Christ but plainly declaiming on the facts of His earthly life (Rom. 1:3, 3:25, 8:3, I Cor. 15:4, II Cor. 8:9, Gal. 4:4, Phil. 2:3, Col. 1:14) and that he knew of this life more than his epistles narrate is plain (I Cor. 11:23).

The idea of Christ, the ideal Jesus that Drews speaks of so much, Him all devout Jews believed in. They waited the consolation of Israel. But, the crux of the whole matter of early Christianity was, Is this He? Whom say men that I am? Paul as Saul accepted the Messiah idea. But Saul became Paul because he accepted the Messiah fact, the Jesus of Damascus as the Jesus of Bethlehem.

Further the strong and able critical examination of our New Testament text by the most competent scholars, men, many of whom were not prejudiced in its historical favor, warrants beyond a shadow of doubt that text as a whole. "The great mass of the early traditions," says Windisch, liberal, "of the teaching, healing, explaining, reprimanding, reforming, persecuted, hated, condemned and crucified Jesus has nothing whatever to do with myth."[66]

Yet to make his view possible Drews must set absolutely aside the Gospel and Epistle narrative. Like Bauer[67] he replaces history and its facts by sheer phantasy. Yet illogically he retains the figures of Paul and Peter for his own purposes, characters which by the following out of his own methods would themselves have to be dissolved in thin mist. Besides, if even proof were at hand that here and there a shadow of doubt fell across the narrative, that does not touch the figure of Jesus. The Roman Em-

66 Th. Rundschau, page 181, May 1910.
67 A. Jeremias—Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, Feb. 1911, p. 162.

perors do not disappear from history even though we are not quite certain that they were not the demigods which their successors insisted they were. The fact of Jesus is in no wise touched by the keeneest of critical thought.

In this defense liberal theology plays a rather poor role. It is handicapped by its own positions and admissions. It follows an idealistic humanistic philosophy which bases history on "heroes."

If Jesus is a human teacher, he might truly have given an uplift, but how came it about that at once after His death He became the object of belief, set at the right hand of God? How did this all come about so quickly? How did the early Christianity get to this high place? If at first Jesus was a poor rabbi and wandering preacher, how was He so soon discovered to be the Christ Jesus of Paul?[68]

But this Christ Jesus He was to the Church. So that the question really is not, as Drews puts it, has Jesus lived, but rather "who is He?" Had Jesus been no person, the polemics against Christianity would have taken quite another turn, its defense another shade.

Drews is a monist, to him there is no need of redemption. Men are self-redemptive.

The simple fact is that for the earliest Christianity, redemption in Jesus Christ stands in the center. And this redemptive feature came into Christianity, not first through Paul and the other Apostles in themselves; these men were but its preachers. They had the authority of their Master behind them from the first. This conclusion, which is as grounded in the early Church as it is in the New Testament, is the carefully considered view of Prof. Ihmels of Leipzig.[69]

The redemptive need was objectified then once in Jesus Christ. He lived. The Gospels and Apostles attested Him who was Jesus, born in Bethlehem in the days of Herod the King. He was in history. He is in the world. Jesus was the subject of which the predicate is Christ. He came unto His own and His own received Him now.

With Westcott—"We look back indeed for a moment upon the

68 R. Grützwacher—Th. R., May 1910.
69 Prof. L. Ihmels—Allg. Zeitung, Jan.6, 1911.

long line of witnesses whose works, attest the efficacy of His unfailing presence. And then we look away from all else to Jesus the leader and perfector of faith."[70]

The effort to dissipate the historical life of Jesus Christ has been an abject failure. The answer of scholarship is the answer of the years, the response which is the echo of the Gospel in Peter's Pentecostal sermon, "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs which God did by Him in the midst of you, Him being delivered up by the determinate council and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay. This Jesus did God raise up- whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus whom ye crucified."[71]

The Church proclaims with solemn acclaim

> Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ,
> Thou art the Everlasting Son of the Father.

70 Westcott—Christus Consummator, p. 159.
71 Acts 2:22.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE III.

THE NEW MEASURE MOVEMENT AS A FACTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

BY REV. GEORGE SCHOLL, D.D.

In the consideration of this subject it should be born in mind that in every well-rounded and symmetrically developed Christian life three faculties or phases of our nature have been brought into an evenly balanced and active exercise. A being capable of a religious experience must, first of all, be intelligent. The knowing faculty is, indeed, the only foundation on which a religious experience can be built. If any one thing has beeen more fully demonstrated than another in the history of Christianity, and especially in the experience of the Church in its efforts to introduce Christianity among a people that were entirely ignorant of its teachings, it is the fact that the first step is to instruct the subject in the fundamental truths or doctrines of religion. The same is true in regard to the child. In every case the beginning is made by instructing the intellect, by developing and enriching the knowing faculty since only an intelligent being is capable of a religious experience.

But this is not enough. We may conceive of one fully instructed in the doctrines of God's Word and yet not being religious in any true sense of the word. He may have thought out and built up a complete system of theology purely as an intellectual exercise as one might work out a logarithmic table, a chemical formula or construct a theory of the universe. The mere knowledge of any truth that enters as a factor into the shaping of life and conduct is not enough. The emotions must be brought to play upon that truth and warm it into life and action. The feelings must be aroused. The heart must be moved. The clear, cold truth must be brought into a state of flux,—set in motion by the warmth of an ardent, passionate love if it is to accomplish its mission of intoning the life and shaping the conduct of him who holds it.

But even this is not enough. We may conceive the case of a mind well stored with truth and the emotional nature aroused

to a high state of ecstasy with no other result than that the individual understands more or less clearly and feels more or less profoundly. And knowing and feeling are such all-important steps in the experience of the individual that they are often taken for the whole of the Christian life instead of as its mere beginnings. And here it is that the willing or doing faculty is to come in and give practical results, completeness of experience, a symmetrical and well-rounded Christian life and character. The intellect, the susceptibility and the will,—the knowing, the feeling and the doing must be brought into proper relation to and proportionate play with and upon each other. It is only by such a combination of faculties and powers that the ideal Christian character is produced.

Aside from the Master Himself, the character and life-work of St. Paul perhaps furnishes the most striking illustration of the proposition with which I have opened this paper,—a proposition which, I believe, all will admit to be logically, psychologically and scripturally correct. A man like Paul, whose intellectual grasp of the great and fundamental truths of revelation,—truths which have to do with the origin, being, mission and destiny of man, is of such a character that he has been pronounced, next to the Master, the author of our system of Christian theology; a man who was so swayed by his emotional nature that, on one occasion at least, he did not know whether he was in the body or out of it, who gave the position of overtowering primacy, in time and eternity, to the emotion of love and declared that it, love, was the impelling and constraining power in his life; and who, at the same time, engaged in the active and practical work of propagating the faith with a zeal that knew no bounds and did not even count life dear to himself if he might only finish his work and fulfill the mission with which he had been entrusted,—this man, towering in intellect, fervent in love and abundant in labors, is in himself an incontrovertable demonstration of the correctness of the proposition that the intellect, the susceptibility and the will, the knowing, the feeling and doing faculties and powers of our nature, must be co-ordinated, brought into harmonious and reciprocal relation to each other, in order to produce the ideal Christian life and character.

If this diagnosis or philosophy of the case, thus briefly and imperfectly stated, is accepted it will not be difficult to account

for the diverse and conflicting manifestation in the lives of individual Christians and in the history of the Christian Church during the almost two thousand years of its existence.

If perfection has not yet been attained by man in the individual life, or in social life, in corporate and political affairs, or in artistic attainments and scientific research (and no one will claim that it has) it ought not to be thought strange that there is still room for improvement in Christian life and character. Perfection seems to exist only in the Supreme Being. Taking humanity alone into the account we might for illustration, place the apostle Paul at the head of the class, and at the foot some poor ignorant heathen who had been brought to the point of being willing to part with his cue as expressive of his desire to enter on a new order of things. Taking these two as the extremes the rest of us fall in line somewhere in between.

Men, as a rule, are notoriously lopsided. Among the best of us in our day it is even a point of credit and distinction to be classed as specialists. The general practitioner in law, in medicine and even in theology is coming to be less and less in evidence. Very few are broad and capable enough, and life is too short, to stretch themselves over the entire field. Our limitations compel us to confine ourselves to a contracted area and concentrate our efforts along some particular line of a profession or calling in order to achieve success and make ourselves felt in the community or in the world. In every department of the world's work this holds true. The order of the day is specialists and specialties.

Now the trouble with humanity seems to be that the great majority of us are not intelligent and philosophical enough to see and understand that while this principle of specializing is all right and indeed necessary in the body corporate of society it is not only not helpful but in fact a positive hindrance in the development of the moral and spiritual side of our nature. We have all met with striking illustrations of this type of life in our churches. Here is a brother who can discourse quite learnedly on the eternal decrees, the modus operandi of the atonement, the significance of the sacraments of the Church and the nature of the resurrection and of the life to come. He might even fill, with more or less credit, the chair of dogmatics in a theological seminary. Intellectually he is well equipped, but he stops there.

Another regularly attends the weekly prayer meeting and seldom fails to avail himself of the privilege of "taking part." He has no use for "head religion" and sits, with eyes closed, and sings his soul away to everlasting bliss while the offering plate is passed. Still another is a pragmatist. He believes in doing things. He has little or no use for the theologian and his fine-spun theories and but scant patience with those who sing rhapsodical hymns, offer heart-touching prayers and deliver soul-stirring exhortations. He is practical.

Now if it were possible to fuse these three types into one we would have the kind of Christian character the Church so greatly stands in need of. Men and women who are fairly well versed in the teachings of God's Word and so are able to give a reason of the hope that is in them, whose hearts are deeply moved by the contemplation of the great truths of revelation and whose ardent love of them will constrain them to spend themselves and be spent in the service of the Master,—this is the all round and symmetrically balanced Christian against whom even the skeptic would hesitate to launch a criticism and whose consistent, godly life in the world would prove a powerful magnet to draw outsiders into the Church. With a goodly number of such men and women in our churches there would be no need to have recourse to fairs and festivals, to stereopticon shows and musical concerts, to lemonade and cigars all of which have proved in the past, and will continue to prove, a snare and delusion, not indeed in the matter of drawing a crowd seeking to be entertained for an evening, but in the effort to further the legitimate work of the Church.

With a goodly number of this kind of men and women in our churches there would also be less of absenteeism on the part of those intellectual and cultured people whose refined taste is offended and even shocked by the sometimes crude and ungrammatical prayers and exhortations of the emotionalists, while the pragmatist, knowing the truth and moved by the power of it, would no longer excuse himself from attending the services of the church, as one did to the writer, on the ground that Elder Jones was doing the praying while he was doing the paying. He believed in specializing in running the church as well as in other lines of business. I do not for a moment wish to be understood as intimating that this type of professors are insincere but

simply that, lacking symmetrical development, they are necessarily weak and inefficient for the work which the Church is set to do in the world.

Turning now from the individual professor and congregation the student of church history finds that the same unbalanced condition of things that we have been considering has obtained, and on a vastly broader scale, in the history of the Church as a whole. There have been periods when the best talent of the Church seems to have given itself up to the construction of great theological systems and the formulation of elaborate creeds. At other times Christendom was swept by a great tidal wave of unreasoning enthusiasm when tens of thousands of devotees perished by the sword of the infidel Turk in the crusades. At a later period of the Church's history, extending down to the time of some of us who are still living, there came another wave, commonly spoken of as "The New Measure Movement" that swept over the Church like the prairie fires in Illinois of fifty years ago, or the forest fires in the Northwest during the past year, leaving some sections of our country in such a condition that they have been aptly designated as "burnt districts."

While this revival movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth century is recognized as a logical and inevitable protest against the formalism and spiritual deadness of the Church that preceded it, the leaders of the movement, and more especially their successors in the work, seem to have suffered at least a partial eclipse of their thinking and reasoning faculties while they enthroned and gave unlimited sway to their emotional nature. The preacher, in many instances, practically abdicated his divinely appointed office as teacher and engaged in passionate oratory and inflammatory exhortation that swept his hearers off the benches and left them groveling on the floor, some groaning and shouting while others, lying for hours in a cataleptic state, had to be carried to their homes by their friends. In my youth I have seen middle aged men, otherwise sane and fairly intelligent, while the major part of the congregation were on their knees, crawling on their hands and knees from bench to bench pounding their brethren on their backs and in stentorian tones exhorting them to call mightily on God to have mercy on the sinners that were present. Not only was the emotional nature given full sway but various extraordinary methods were employ-

ed to work up the feelings. Boisterous singing, pious ejaculations, doleful groanings, clapping of the hands, pounding on the back, hand shaking, swaying of the body and other physical exercises were no uncommon manifestations when the preacher, aided by brethren and sisters endowed with extraordinary lung power and much physical endurance, had succeeded in working up an interest. I speak not of what has been reported to me but of what I myself have seen and heard.

It is not my purpose to discredit in the least degree what we speak of as a season of revival, but we must be careful to discriminate between the revival of religion and the methods sometimes resorted to in connection therewith. Some one has said that the fact that Christianity has survived in the world in spite of some of the methods employed for its propagation is at least one of the proofs of its divinity.

The New Measure Movement then, as I understand it, refers to the various methods employed in "getting up" and conducting revivals and these, in my humble judgment, have not only not been a helpful factor in the development of the General Synod but on the other hand have proved a positive hindrance to the progress of our Church that can be measured only by decades if not by a whole century. We must be careful, I repeat, to discriminate between the revival and the abnormal and unscriptural usages sometimes, not always, connected with and employed in a work of this kind. Take, for illustration, the revival that swept over Baltimore City about seventy years ago. It is said to have started in the old "Round Top" Baptist Church located at that time at the corner of Lombard and Sharp Sts., now at Fremont and Lafayette Aves. The interest increased and spread to other churches including the First Lutheran, and at that time our only English church in the city, of which Dr. Morris was pastor. That revival resulted in the addition of about 250 members to its communion and was the immediate cause of the establishment of the Second church on Lombard street, a little later on of the planting of the Third church on Monument near Gay, and still later was, to say the least, the indirect occasion of the organization of St. Mark's Church on Eutaw street.

That was a genuine work of grace that gave our Church a body of spiritually minded and active men and women that proved a very important factor in the development of the Lu-

theran Church of the General Synod type in this city. But there was another feature connected with that work in 1840 that must be reckoned with if we would get a correct estimate of its influence on our Church in Baltimore. The New Measures, so called, then in vogue became so identified with the work, in the minds of those good people, that they became practically incapable of recognizing the possibility of any one coming into the kingdom except under the conditions and by the methods employed at the time they were converted. For thirty, forty and fifty years those good people were continually harking back to the revival under Elder Knapp, lamenting the decadence of piety and not unfrequently criticising their pastors for not employing the methods (meaning the so-called New Measures) that had proved so effective in their day. Catechization of the young was regarded with scant favor and mere "book religion" contrasted unfavorably with "Holy Ghost religion." When the admission by confirmation of a class of catechumens was to be sanctioned by vote of the Church Council the question was raised again and again, "What reason have you for believing that these young people have been soundly converted and are fit for church membership?" For weeks before the time for the confirmation services the pastor would take occasion from the pulpit to hammer into the minds of his hearers the idea that the Church is a nursery for the care and training of the crooked little twigs into straight and strong fruit bearing trees, a factory or work-shop for shaping raw material into forms of service and beauty, the school of Christ for the education and development of the children and young people in the knowledge and service of God, rather than a warehouse in which to store the finished goods ready for shipment to Heaven. And this he did largely because he was afraid his class of catechumens, some of whom were the children of Christian parents, all in the Sunday School from the infant department up and faithfully instructed in the catechism for months, would be turned down because there might be some doubt as to whether they had been genuinely converted. In the case of some of those good and grand fathers in Israel it took all of a quarter to half a century to disabuse their minds of the idea (and no doubt some passed on to glory unpersuaded) that the New Measure plan was, to say the least, the best if not the only way of entering the kingdom.

From the day of Pentecost down to the present time the Church has had experience of seasons of revival and these epochs in her history have marked greater or less advance in spirituality and practical piety. But human nature being what it is it could hardly have been expected that some extravagances and even gross errors would not attend a movement that was so largely under the guidance of the emotionalist. Impassioned oratory, together with the fife and the drum, have proved powerful and effective factors in recruiting men for the army of the country, and similar methods are even now being employed, as in the Salvation Army, for gaining recruits for the Lord's army. By powerfully exciting the emotions, by playing on the feelings, crowds may be and have been swept into this that or the other movement at the will of the skilful manipulator, and the movement may be in the direction of a lynching bee, a labor strike, or the army or the Lord. In the last analysis it will be found that the underlying principle is primarily and fundamentally the same.

In every genuine revival of religion, however, whether the subject of such revival was an individual, a church or a whole community, it will be seen that it was the intelligent, persistent and earnest presentation of the great and fundamental truths of revealed religion that touched and moved the heart and swept the subject onward and upward into a new life of peace and joy and practical activity in the Master's service.

Such play on the emotions is a legitimate process. It is a normal, rational and logical movement of a well balanced mentality; and for the coming of such a revival every intelligent Christian will earnestly labor and fervently pray. But in such genuine revivals it has frequently occurred that the effect has been taken for the cause, and presently the attempt is made to "get up" a revival by resorting to genuflections and prostrations, to noise, disorder and extravagant rant. In this way the feelings may be worked up and aroused into at least a resemblance of that joy unspeakable which often and quite naturally follows the sense of pardoned sin. It is very much as if one should by friction or some form of mechanical manipulation of the thermometer cause the mercury to rise up into the nineties and then draw the conclusion that summer had come. A summer gotten up after that style is generally followed by a "cold spell" that

leaves the individual or Church not only in a worse state than before but also makes it vastly more difficult to bring about a genuine work of grace.

At the present time the Protestant churches of this country, and indeed of the world, seem to be waking up to the fact that the time has come in the history of the Church when there should be something doing that is worth while. What do preaching and praying and the singing of hymns amount to unless by such devotional exercises we are led to address ourselves in some practical, adequate and businesslike way to the work of evangelizing the world. This, I say, seems to be the sadly belated idea that is beginning to voice itself in the Church with some degree of emphasis.

I do not mean to say that this third stage in the Christian life, the very flower and fruitage of it, the doing of the will of the Master, has not yet been reached, but the Church itself, as expressed in the Laymen's Movement for the extension of the Kingdom, has declared and is declaring itself very positively, that what has heretofore been done is not at all commensurate with the necessities of the situation or the ability of the Master's followers. A prominent and well informed clergyman in our church has declared it to be his belief that in well nigh every congregation in our communion there are individual members who could and ought to give as much for the extension of the Kingdom as is now given by the entire congregation; that there are single congregations in every synod that could give more than is now contributed by the whole synod; and that there are single district synods that could give more than is now given by the General Synod as a whole.

In thus emphasizing the doing part of our religion we are, of course, not to neglect to enrich the intellect, or to suppress our feelings, but rather to strive after a broader, deeper and fuller understanding of our relation to God's Kingdom and its needs and to kindle in our hearts an ardent love, a burning zeal that will lead us to give ourselves and our means to the practical work of the world's salvation in measures heretofore unthought of.

What I have said thus far may possibly not be regarded as bearing directly on the subject, but I believe it furnishes us the ground work or, at least, a philosophical basis on which we may take our stand without fear of successful re-

futation from any quarter. I am aware of the fact that the revivals of religion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are spoken of as the New Measure Movement, but I do not admit that to be a correct definition of the term. Revivals are not new measures. They are not only as old as Pentecost but reach back through Old Testament history wherein are chronicled a number of famous revivals. The genuine revival, taking place under the Old or New dispensation, in ancient or modern times, has been fraught with great blessing and far-reaching benefit to the life of the Church whatever branch or communion may have been the subject of such divine visitation. Our position as a Church will be impregnable, I think, if we stand squarely and firmly in favor of the revival and just as firmly against the New Measures and methods that were so generally connected with them in the past century. Take as an illustration of the validity of this position, the experience of our own Church in Baltimore City. The fact is that, for the first thirty years following the revival under Elder Knapp, when the minds of the people were more or less obsessed with the New Measure idea, comparatively little progress was made by our Church in this city, while during the succeeding thirty years, when we had gotten measurably back to the saner and more Lutheran methods of work, the number of our churches has increased almost five hundred per cent.

Other instances might be cited to show that the progress of the work of our Church has been delayed many decades by a similar condition of things so that we are warranted in concluding that the New Measure Movement (bearing in mind the distinction between the revival and the measure) has not only not been a factor in the development of the General Synod, but on the contrary, has greatly crippled and retarded the growth of our Church.

The rupture which began at York, Pa., in 1864, was the final culmination of the Definite Platform movement as over against the Unaltered Augsburg Confession position, and it would not be an easy task to adequately set forth the great harm done to our Church by the split at Fort Wayne in 1866. Brethren in the ministry became alienated and viewed each other with suspicion; congregations were disrupted resulting in prolonged and bitter lawsuits for the possession of church property; opposition

congregations struggled for a foothold in communities barely able to support one church; each branch must have its own colleges, theological seminaries, periodicals, orphanages, mission boards, publication houses, etc., resulting in a wasteful dissipation of energy and of means besides presenting to the world the sad and humiliating spectacle of a house divided against itself.

More recently and quite within the memory of well nigh all our readers, came the conflict between the so-called radicals and conservatives following the adoption of the Common Service by the three leading bodies of our Church. What was intended to be a bond of union between the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod of the South and is, we have reason for believing, slowly but surely working to that end, was made the occasion of a bitter controversy that very seriously disturbed the peace of the Church and hindered the progress of its legitimate work.

At bottom the same cause was at work,—namely the failure to recognize the fact that deep, earnest and practical piety is quite as likely to be found in connection with a uniform, orderly and dignified service in God's house as with a haphazzard-on-the-spur-of-the-moment-go-as-you-please style of worship. And we have reason for believing that more and more the Church is coming to this conclusion. With the faithful use of the means of grace in the orderly and intelligent manner that has characterized the Lutheran Church in her past history we can see no reason why we should not continue in the years to come, as in the past, to grow in piety, in devotion to the Master and in every form of practical work for the extension of His Kingdom.

Baltimore, Md.

ARTICLE IV.

THE LIFE AND MESSAGE OF TOLSTOI.

BY REV. UPTON A. HANKEY, D.D.

Tolstoi, the sensitive, the voluptuous, the rich, the independent, the intellectual, the idealistic, the affectionate, the ingenuous, the religious, the critic, the reformer, the socialist, the "full-fledged nihilist," the erratic, the unclassifiable, by the force of his many-sided personality, and acknowledged ability, has challenged the attention of the reading and thinking world. Having run the whole gamut of human life and passion, few have experienced more widely contrasted phases of life. Born into the higher circle of Russian aristocracy, associated with the best writers of his day, and standing on the high plane of ethical Christianity, he preached—for he was in one sense a preacher, never having written anything, without taking a text of Scripture—he preached on—non-resistance no matter how severe the provocation, equal labor for all no matter how menial, and a literal obedience to the Words of Christ as taught in His Sermon on the Mount. His message, though mostly unwelcome to us, is listened to by many, and is determinedly effecting the current thought of our time in some basic matters.

With kaleidoscopic characteristics this man looms up before us as, in many respects, very great, and very good, "One of the greatest and best of his time," says W. Dean Howells. For the reason that he was separated from us by the earth's diameter and a strange tongue, he is comparatively little known, and few private libraries have many or any of his books. But to those who are looking out on the horizon of things, he is seen towering up like a mountain in the distance with natural springs and verdant growths at the base, but whose brow is obscurely veiled in mist and cloud.

This great Russian novelist, social reformer, and ethical preacher of Christianity, was born August 28, 1828, on the paternal estate, Yasnaya Polyana (Clearfield), situated one hundred and twenty miles south of Moscow. Here he passed nearly all of his life. His family is said to have been of German de-

scent originally bearing the plebeian name of "Dick" (Stout), which was changed to its Russian equivalent, Tolstoi, when his ancestors migrated into that country at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Peter Tolstoi, the first eminent member of the family, was an intimate friend of Peter the Great, by whom he was richly endowed and raised to courtly rank. The father of our hero was described by those who knew him as a stately, fascinating personage, his mother was a lady of personal charms and of great wealth, tender, plaintive, mystical, as scarcely belonging to this world. She possessed the gift of inventing tales and stories, which her son certainly inherited from her.

Being early orphaned Tolstoi's early education was neglected; after schooling on his maternal estate, two years were spent at the University of Kazan; but he acknowledged that he learned more from the simple peasantry, and field and forest. He had "enormous resources of natural gift," the high order of genius that could unite the culture of the schools with the perennial springs of intuition. His desire was to excel everyone in everything. Even physically it was his ambition to be stronger and more dexterious than his companions. On his return to Yasnaya Polyana his steward coming to him in the morning for orders would frequently find him hanging in flannels, head downwards, on a trapeze, in which position he would discuss the best modes of sowing and threshing, the steward accompanying him round and round the room as he turned somersaults without interrupting the conversation. This was to him what the hewing down of trees was to Gladstone, or to Roosevelt. An account of his boyhood appears in "My Confession," where we learn that he was brought up in the Orthodox Russian Church, amidst a life with its strange intermixture of patriarchal and aristocratic manners. He was bright and quick, but not good looking, as he one day made the discovery in the looking-glass that there was nothing aristocratic in his face, but on the contrary he was for all the world like a peasant, or "moujik."

After a few years on his estate, having secured a commission in the army, he served in the artillery in the Crimea and took active part in the defense of the city of Sevastopol, when he "gayly advanced to bastion four, the bastian of death." It was war itself which taught Tolstoi to abhor war. At the end of

the war he entered upon a literary career, went to St. Petersburg where he was welcomed by the highest literary circles of the day. For some years before this, and now, he led a dissipated life, drank, gambled, and fought duels, like his companions, but his soul all the while yearned for something better. He made at this time a tour of Europe to visit the great thinkers of England and the continent to question them as to the meaning of life.

Returning to Yasnaya Polyana, he became head-master of a village school—the first free school that ever existed in Russia—published an educational journal, wrote a number of school books, became a country magistrate, and strove chiefly for the instruction and improvement of the peasantry. His pedagogical methods were revolutionary. He adopted the ideas that "all constraint is dangerous," and that "teachers ought to consult not their own convenience, but the convenience of their pupils." His pupils were allowed to do as they liked, they could come and go at will, sit on the floor or on chairs, group together in a corner or stand at the window, for there was no discipline of any sort. He never taught anything they did not wish to learn, never took up a lesson to which the children objected, nor continued it when their interest began to lag. He believed an atmosphere of freedom was more favorable to education than one of coercion. Accordingly he was not the least worried when his scholars deserted the room and took a holiday or two each week.

The romance of his marriage about this time to a daughter of a Moscow physician, is rather minutely described in his novel, "Anna Karenina," in the courtship of Kitty and Levine. The union proved completely happy, and began the most joyous period of Tolstoi's life. They lived in the country and rarely went to town. He wished nothing better than to pass his days in the bosom of his family, and hated to be away even a single day, and would hasten home when the detaining business was transacted.

The light of a better life now began to dawn on his soul, and his oft reading of the Gospel inclined him thoroughly to the practice of love, humanity, meekness, self-denial, and a returning of good for evil. His strange instinctive affection for the working classes moved him to seek their welfare, and he began to think that if he would attain to an understanding of the mean-

ing of life, he must seek it amongst those who have not lost their grip upon it, among the millions who live close to nature. Accordingly he applied himself to the study of the simple, unlearned, poor peasantry of his neighborhood, and the more he studied them, the more he became convinced that they had a true faith. They passed their days contentedly in heavy labor; they lived, suffered, and drew near death in quiet confidence and even joy. He describes this period of conflict as a feeling after God, an effort to apprehend what God is.

Accordingly he renounced the life of his own class, as he tells us in his "Confessions," for he had come to see that it was not a real life, only the semblance of one, that its superfluous luxury prevented the possibility of understanding life, and that in order so to do he must know, not an exceptional parasitic life, but the simple life of the working classes. He also left the Church because as he believed its adherents did not practice the truths of the Gospel. He commenced the study of the Gospels for himself with unusual thoroughness and patience, taking up the Greek language, so that he might not be misled by translators, and entering fully into the Spirit of the Gospels he read and re-read them, and was most deeply impressed by the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, all of which he understood literally, allowing no place for poetic temperament, oriental imagery, or beautiful metaphor.

It might be best at this place to glance briefly at the remaining years of Tolstoi's life, before taking up the consideration of his system of ethics, or forming an idea of his message, and opinions as a whole. He himself divides his life into four periods: First, that splendid, innocent, joyful, poetic period of childhood; second, those dreadful twenty years of coarse dissoluteness, of ambition, of vanity, of sensuousness; third, the period from his marriage until his spiritual birth; and lastly, the interesting closing period in which he regards himself as truly having lived.

Once again he made Moscow his brief home, and devoted himself to philanthropic work. He engaged in taking the census of the city ,and was deeply impressed with the number of poor in the population. He made up his mind that every man should perform some manual labor, and selected for his own, while he

was in town, the sawing of wood in the wood-yards of the suburbs.

Filled with disgust for the fashionable life he had been so long living, he felt an irresistible impulse to renounce the luxuries of his position, and began to wear a peasant's garb as a protest against the falsehoods of caste and monopoly. He wanted to exemplify the literal teachings of Christ, and live as He had lived. He stripped his house of everything superfluous, there was not a rug on the floor, nor an ornament on the table, nor a picture on the wall; his dress was a peasant's blouse; he became a vegetarian, and touched neither tea nor coffee, nor sugar, nor tobacco; and beside his plain book-cases stood his scythe, axe and pick. He sat at one end of the table and ate from bare boards his coarse meal, while his family was served with the finest delicacies by servants.

He had no use for money. Mr. W. D. Howells says, "There is this about such poverty—that it is imaginative in essence and dramatic in form rather than real. The man experienced poverty; lived the life of the poor, wore their clothes, and ate their food, but he could not feel the dread that is never lifted from the very poor, the dread of actual want. He was defended from the consequences of his precept and his practice by the inalienable wealth of his family. It was undeniably grotesque, but it was also pathetic, almost the most pathetic predicament in history for a noble and sincere and unselfish man."

About two weeks before the end of his life with no other explanation of his purpose than that he intended "to retire from the world," he left his home and embarked on a journey toward a vague destination. In order to cover his movements he announced that he was going to Moscow, but later changed cars and boarded a slow train for the Caucasus. Tolstoi, with two companions, made his way to an unventilated third-class compartment, which was already overcrowded with peasants. He developed a fever and left the train at Astafova, a little flag station, where he died. A letter sent to his wife at the outset of his journey contained these pathetic lines: "I retire from the world to complete my life in solitude. I ask that you do not seek my place of sojourn, and that you do not come to it, if it is discovered. I beg forgiveness for the grief that I may cause you."

It was unfortunate that his belief and habits forced a so dramatic close of his career; but such were the circumstances surrounding his life that he could not possibly die wanting, as a peasant, unattended, and bare, but was found and ministered to by loving hands in his closing moments, and the simple announcement of his death brought the whole literary world to his dying bed, notwithstanding that he wanted to keep them all away.

"Come not, when I am dead,
To drop thy foolish tears upon my grave,
To trample round my fallen head,
And vex the unhappy dust thou wouldst not save,
There let the wind sweep and the plover cry;
But thou, go by.
I am sick of time,
And I desire to rest.
Pass on weak heart, and leave me where I lie.
Go by, go by."

These words of Tennyson well express the world-wearied spirit of this man for whom wealth, fame, pleasure, life and death, had not any more a meaning.

His treatise "On Life" is a sane and readable book, which seems to take hold of the reader with a strange power. It is through the reading and understanding of this treatise that we should approach his ethical system. Here we get the central point of view of his opinions. Most men, he says, lead only to animal life. Our real life begins with the awakening of our consciousness, at the moment when we perceive that life lived for self cannot produce happiness. We feel that there must be some other good: we make an effort to find it, but failing, we fall back into our old ways. These are the first throes of the birth of the veritable human life. Love is the only true manifestation of life. It is an activity which has for its object the good of others.

He mentions five ways for strengthening ourself on the path of life: attention to the Word of God, communion with saints, peaceful intercourse with men, renunciation of property, and the recognition over oneself and over others of no other power

than the one which is given by the spirit of truth. He simply says: "Renounce your selfish ends; love all men—all creatures—and devote your life to them. You will then be conscious of possessing eternal life, and for you there will be no death." Immortality is an assured conviction, eternal life may not be personal, but absorption with the infinite. There is no resurrection of the body. This states briefly his philosophy of life.

We now turn to a consideration of his *social message.* Tolstoi was a socialist of the first rank, an ardent lover of men, ready to sacrifice everything for society's sake. He also denounces patriotism, saying for a Christian there is no country, for a Christian there is no property, for a Christian all are equal. "The more a man gives to others and the less he asks for himself, the better he is; the less he gives to others and the more he demands for himself, the worse he is."

The writing of his great novel, "Anna Karenina," reflects his disgust with the frivolities and light tinsel of society, and all conventional forms of life. After its appearance he adopted the peasant's life and labors, and developed more fully his socialistic scheme of philosophy. Renouncing all desire for fame, speaking contemptuously of his writings, and regarding them as objects of misdirected labors, he devotes all his time, talents and energies to the improvement of the peasant classes, working at the shoemaker's bench and in the fields, eating plowman's fare, and striving for the day when as he hoped there should no longer be either organized religion or government, and that all people should dwell together in equality and peace and mutual brotherliness, none high, none low, none rich, none poor, none better, none worse. Tolstoi set himself against all class distinctions, as the main source of enmity between men. "I can no longer," he says, "try to rise above other men, to separate myself from them, nor can I admit either rank or title for myself or others, except the title of 'man.' I can no longer seek fame or glory, nor can I help trying to get rid of my riches which separate me from my fellow creatures. I cannot help seeking in my way of life, in its surroundings, in my food, my clothes, my manners, to draw nearer the majority of men, and to avoid all that separates me from them." He wrought for such a condition of society when all men shall fulfill Christ's commands.—when they

shall not quarrel, nor be selfish, nor swear, nor offer violence, nor wage war upon one another.

"We are brothers," he says, "but every morning my brother or sister performs for me the most menial offices. We are brothers; but I must have my cigar, my sugar, my mirror, or what not,—objects whose manufacture has often cost my brothers and sisters their health, yet I do not for that reason forbear to use these things; on the contrary I even demand them. We are brothers; and yet I support myself by working in some bank, commercial house, or shop, and am always trying to raise the price of the necessities of life for my brothers and sisters. We are brothers; I receive a salary for judging, convicting and punishing the thief, or the prostitute, whose existence is the natural outcome of my own system of life, and I fully realize that I should neither condemn nor punish. We are brothers; yet I make my living by collecting taxes from the poor, that the rich may live in luxury and idleness." He once went to see a sick beggar and witnessed terrible poverty. "What I ought really to have done," he says, "would have been to have remained there and not have gone away, until he was made equal with me." "True life," he holds, "is only in the relations between men." A man comes to speak with me. I am busy, to finish is the form the plan; and the visitor is the man and my relation to him,—this is true life. We must stop demanding other people's service. It seems strange, but the first thing we have to do, before anything else, is to serve ourselves, that is, to make our own fires, fetch our own water, cook our own dinners, and wash our own dishes and dirty linen."

Ownership is a fiction,—an imaginary something, which exists only for those who believe in Mammon, and so serve him. The believer in Christ's teaching is freed from ownership. Ownership with the right to defend it and with the duty of the government to secure and recognize it, is not only not a Christian, but an anti-Christian, invention. Make your own spoon to eat with it, and that, too, so long as another person does not need it. If there were no money, nor anything connected with it, a man could not help but have bread; and if there were no Tsar, nor that which is connected with him, nobody would be sitting in a prison. These thoughts well express his revolt against modern life.

His external extravagant social conceptions are not illogically due to the wretched social system of inequality, unfraternity and oppression with the starving millions of Russians, and the upper crust of society remaining entirely indifferent to the immanent calamities. It was as he saw, an anti-Christian, non-brotherly relation of cultured people to the poor, and the manual laborers who were always experiencing want, suffering and sorrow.

He is equally bitter in denunciation of all law and government. Laws are the offspring of party conflicts, false dealing, and the greed of gain; and therefore it is impossible for people to believe that obedience to civil or state laws can ever satisfy the rational demands of human nature. A Christian who submits to the inner, the divine law, is unable to execute the biddings of the outward law, as in the case of the demands made upon him by the government. He cannot acknowledge the obligation of obeying any individual whomsoever, cannot acknowledge himself to be what is called a subject. For a Christian to promise to subject himself to any government whatsoever—a subjection which may be considered the foundation of State life—is a direct negation of Christianity; since an individual who promises beforehand to obey implicitly every law that men may enact, by that promise utters an emphatic denial of Christianity, whose very essence is obedience in all contingencies to the law which he feels to be within him—the law of love. Christianity faithfully interpreted, saps the foundations of the civil law. Until men felt the necessity of justifying the establishment of the Christian State, they always accepted that interpretation. The cleverly constructed theories intended to reconcile the doctrines of Christianity with that of the State date back to the time when rulers of nations adopted a nominal, external Christianity. But in these times it is impossible for a sincere and earnest man not to perceive the incompatibility of the Christian doctrine of love, meekness of spirit, and forgiveness of injuries, with the despotism, the violence, and the wars of the State. The profession of true Christianity not only forbids the recognition of the State, but strikes at its very foundations. It cannot be proved, as the partizans of the State claim, that its destruction would be followed by a general upheaval, by robberies and murders, and by the nullification of all social laws, and the return of man to a condition of barbarism. The State may at one

time have been necessary, but "I can only say I have no need of it, nor can I conform to its requirements, I need none of the institutions established by the State."

Some say we cannot dispense with the State until all men are Christians, because even among those who claim the title there are many who are very far from being Christian—evil doers, who seek their own gratification at the expense of their fellow-men, and if the governments were overthrown, so far from improving the condition of the people, it would greatly add to their miseries. But when they declare that the evil doers would ride roughshod over the defenseless and innocent were it not for the authority of the State, they imply that the governing power is vested always in a body of virtuous men who control all the evil doers. The wicked always rule over the good and do violence to them. Cain did violence to Abel, the astute Jacob betrayed the trusting Esau, and was himself deceived by Laban; Caiaphas and Pilate sat in judgment on Christ; the Roman emperors ruled over Seneca, Epictetus, and others. So whether the State is or is not to be abolished, the position of the innocent, who are oppressed by the tyrants, will not be materially changed.

Men are not to be frightened by being told that the wicked will oppress the good, because that is the natural course, and will never change. Therefore the defenders of the existing social system are self-deceived when they say that, since violence barely holds the evil and un-Christian elements of society in awe, its subversion, and the substitution of the moral influence of public opinion, would leave us helpless in face of them. They are wrong, because violence does not protect mankind; but it deprives men of the only possible chance of an effectual defense by the establishment and propagation of the Christian principle of life.

He claims that the position of the Christian world, with its fortresses, cannon, dynamite, guns, torpedoes, prisons, gallows, Churches, factories, custom houses, and palaces, is monstrous.

Tolstoi preached non-resistance with unceasing zeal. The words of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount were taken by him in their literal sense as, "That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee

to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." On this he says, "Never resist evil by violence. If any one smites thee, bear it; if any one takes away what is thine, let him have it; if any one make thee labor, do so." We can make no greater mistake than to lift our hand against wrong. The man who will not strike back is the only man who cannot be conquered, and the treatment of him becomes an insoluble problem for the tyrant. It is the non-resistant alone who can overcome superior power. "If all the members of a family were Christians and gave up their lives to the service of others, no one would despoil them or kill them."

That this idea of non-resistance touches a chord in the human heart cannot be denied, but this ideal state is far to reach, and we may quote the words of Tennyson in "The Golden Year"—

> "Ah! when shall all men's good
> Be each man's rule, and universal Peace
> Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
> And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
> Thro' all the circle of the Golden Year?"
> "Ah, folly! for it lies so far away,
> Not in our time, nor in our children's time,
> 'Tis like the second world to us that live;
> 'T were all as one to fix our hopes on Heaven
> As on this vision of the Golden Year."

We now come to examine and analyze his *distinctively religious views.* He posed as a religious reformer. His extremely cynical and critical views of things, his pessimism, are undoubtedly the clear revulsion from his earlier appalling dissipations, now bringing forward their meed of retribution. He feels himself called to denounce and renounce the whole order of things, and we have a volume of anathemas against civilization, science, Church, State, and even art itself. His theology is mystical and rationalistic. In summing up the results of his Gospel studies, he expresses his firm belief in Christ's teachings, and that happiness on earth is possible only when all men fulfil Christ's teaching, which is possible, easy and pleasant. "I understand now," he says, "that He alone is above all others who humbles

himself before others, and makes himself the servant of all. Everything that once seemed to me right and important—honor, glory, civilization, wealth, the complications and refinements of life, luxury, rich food, fine clothing, etiquette—has become for me wrong and despicable. Rusticity, obscurity, poverty, austerity, simplicity of surroundings, of food, of clothing, of manners, all have become right and important to me. I cannot encourage or take part in licentious pastimes, novels, plays, poems, balls and the like, which are so many snares for myself and for others."

He estimates life and every act by the Sermon on the Mount, all of which he understands in a literal sense. His book entitled "My Religion," sets forth distinctly most of his religious views, and is an exegetical commentary upon Christ's Sermon on the Mount. As an example of his independent exegesis we cite Matthew 5:32, "But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." He claims to have examined all commentators from Chrysostom to the most learned of the present day, and pronounces them all in error. This passage gives no sanction for divorce; for the marriage relation is indissoluble. The usual interpretation here which throws the guilt of marital infidelity upon the woman is strange and unexpected, and here in relation to the context, absurd. The word πορνέια is an entirely different word from μοιψεία and never signifies an act, but a quality, a state of depravity and never can be translated "adultery," or "fornification," which idea is always expressed through the Gospels by μοιψεία The passage clears up if the word translated "adultery," or "fornification," is translated "libertinism." This sets forth the purport of the qualifying phrase, "Saving for the cause of fornification," and throws the guilt of marital infidelity on the man, and not the woman only. After many pages of close exegetical sifting and weighing he declares the meaning to be this, "whoever puts away his wife, besides being himself guilty of libertinism, exposes her also to the commission of adultery." Christ replies to the theory of the Pharisees, who held that a man who abandons his wife to marry another without the intention of giving himself up to libertinism, does not commit adultery. Christ replies to

this theory that the abandonment of a wife, even if not for the purpose of libertinism, but to marry another, is none the less adultery. The passage is construed thus: "Whoever puts away his wife, besides the fault of libertinism, obliges her to be an adulteress."

Another example of his exegesis is found in the word "enemy," where Christ says, "Love your enemies." This is not a personal enemy, but a foreigner, a person of another than the Hebrew race. In fact to him the Gospels have many additions and interpretations, and are much like a sack of refuse in which are a number of infinitely precious pearls.

He sums up the teachings of Christ in five commands:

1. Live in peace with all men. 2. Be pure. 3. Take no oaths. 4. Never resist evil. 5. Renounce racial distinctions. "A man has but to understand his life as Christianity teaches him to understand it; that is, he must realize that it does not belong to himself, nor to his family, nor to the State, but to Him who sent him into the world."

Tolstoi's name is anathema to all orthodox theology. Christian virtues are admired and exalted by him, but all Christian institutions and doctrines are detested and opposed. He calls for the abolition of the Church as well as the State. The Sermon on the Mount and human creeds, like the Apostles' and Nicene, according to his view, exclude each other. Human creeds have no meaning to one who believes in the Sermon on the Mount. "The more mystical grew the apprehension of Christ's teaching," says he, "the more the miraculous element entered into it; and the more miraculous it became, the farther it was from its original meaning; and the more complicated, mystical and remote from its original meaning it came to be, the more necessary it was to declare its infallibility."

His theology is quite mystical and profoundly rationalistic; a queer blending of the elements of Quakerism and Rationalism. It is understood to deny miracles, the inspiration of the Bible, the descent of the spirit, the validity of prayer, the divinity and resurrection of Christ, the atonement by blood, and that Christ ever founded anything like the Church in its ecclesiastical sense. He regards the Old Testament on a par with the literature of other early people. He disapproves of Paul's epistles, whom he accuses of giving a fatal bias to Christ's teachings, and turning

men's minds from their simplicity and directness. He quotes scornfully Paul's expression, "The powers that be are ordained of God." Jesus is to him only an example of supreme influence. The Trinity is denied and also the need of the Sacraments. The chief doctrines of the Church are called "fallacious conceptions of Christianity," "perversions of the professors of theology," "contemptible inventions," "foolish superstitions," and "old-time paganisms."

The reasons for his extreme bitterness against the Church and its dogmas are not far to seek, when we consider his environment of the corrupt Russian Church, its superstitions in veneration of images and relics, in the spitting of the sponsors at the devil at the baptism of a child, and children kneeling before a board with painted pictures of Christ and the saints, and other superstitions forms which destroy the vital conception of Christianity.

Tolstoi won his world-wide distinction by *his literary work.* "The domain of his genius was fiction, and not the bewildering muddlements of a pseudo-philosophy." As to his attempted social and religious reforms, we may say in Tennyson's lines:

> "Our little systems have their day;
> They have their day and cease to be;
> They are but broken lights of thee,
> And Thou, O Lord, art more than they."

His peculiar philosophy and ethics will not live, but his short stories will have an enduring day. However his system of philosophy is concretely woven through his allegorical tales. These "Tales" are serious and curious, most skillful in invention, uplifting and helpful in their general tone. They were written as tracts, or sermons (as many of them have a text of Scripture to start with) for the peasants, and represent the author's views of the real life which earns bread literally in the sweat of the brow, and does good for evil, makes no resistance to violence, and is victorious over temptation. His theories of communism, of non-resistance, of the blessings of poverty, of a laboring life, and of unselfish service are concretely expressed in these short stories. To Tolstoi's mind

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and lords may flourish, or may fade,
A breath can make them, as a breath has made,
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supplied."

Tolstoi's great genius must be conceded, and none will deny his naivete; his endowment of sincerety and truthfulness, his recognition of life's facts, and that he preached humility and purity. But as to the beneficial tendency of some of his books opinions differ. Our judgment is that many of his books are exceedingly injurious and pernicious to the public mind. His conclusions are new, unexpected, and contrary to what are usually held. Many of his books, however, can be read with profit by the clergy; for many sermon-seeds and illustrations may be found in them; especially is this true of his "Short Tales," "The Kingdom of God is Within You," "Life," "What is Art?" his "Confession," his "Religion," "Resurrection," and his letters. He is a master of illustration, and his illustrations are taken from nature and everyday life.

We recall the names of some of his books not already mentioned, "The Cossacks," "The Death of Ivan Ilyitch," "Master and Man," "The Kreutzer Sonata," "Scenes of the Siege of Sevastopol," "The Invaders," "The Russian Proprietors," "Esarhaddon," and as paramount the five volumes of "War and Peace." This masterpiece of the world's literature, a library in itself, its thousands of pages transcribed with his own hand seven times before he was satisfied with it, is the history of the life and death struggle of the Russian nation with its most terrible enemy, the first Napoleon. The Russian nation is the real hero of the romance. The character of Napoleon is portrayed vividly in the flesh in these pages. The philosophy of these books is tinged with Schopenhauerism, and religion is discarded. In "Anna Karenina" we find in photographic minuteness human weakness growing into crime and misery. It well contrasts the frivolities and vanities of the worldly life with the sweet, holy calm enjoyed by those who live contentedly amidst the beauties of nature and the pleasures of the family. The book, though pronounced one of the greatest novels in literature,

is, in my judgment, injurious, and like raking in the filth of a cesspool rather than in the clean soil of the garden. On the fly-leaf of the volume owned by the Carnegie Circulating Library of Pittsburg, are found the words, "This book must not be loaned to minors." Other books as "My Confession," "Resurrection," "My Religion," set forth completely his ethical system. Tolstoi himself appears in most of his books, and may be identified with Levine in "Anna Karenina," and with Piere in his volumes of "War and Peace." This key enables us to get more fully in hand at first sources the life and message of this remarkable man, whose name W. D. Howells places beside that of Napoleon, and Lincoln, as the three supreme names of the century in which these men lived.

It is worthy of observation that all his books, short stories, and his novels, start with a text of Scripture, and all his writings are suffused with Scripture quotations, many very lengthy. His literature is inseparable from his religion, and his art seems always most spiritual. He hated the evils in the characters he depicted, and loved the good. He is didactic in all his books, and writes as if he were writing a text-book, and never loses an opportunity to teach his ethical views. He is a rationalistic mystic, a rare combination of Quakerism and Unitarianism. The church historian would place him among the deformation types of Christianity. It is worthy of note that, in these days when Mormonism holds its own, and Eddyism flourishes, and even Eliotism hovers on the horizon, the Tolstoian sects both in Europe and this country have failed. Jane Addams tried to put his socialistic ideas into practice at the Hull House, Chicago, but has recently acknowledged her failure.

Tolstoi was an ardent advocate of the return to nature and the soil, but unlike Rousseau's scheme, it is nature sanctified by the religious element. He was a man of the tenderest sympathies and firmest convictions, the laboring peasants best advocate. His religion was a religion of spirit.

Tolstoi's social code levels down. "You are my brother," says he to the poor and degraded, "and therefore I will live with you and be one of you." He is truly a son of his own country, identified with his people and age. He is narrow while he professes to write a message for humanity; he is provincial, iconoclastic, illogical, lacking in completeness and fullness of

life, a strange figure, "a colossal personality. If you were to ask, "What did Tolstoi do?" "What did he accomplish?" I would answer, he lived an exemplary life, aimed to be an example of Christ's teachings, overturned established values, threw a searching light upon society, Church and State, and sought to turn men to the pure teachings of Christ as found in the Sermon on the Mount.

We have endeavored to give a resume, to reflect the life and mssage of this man, as discoverable in his writings; this peasant nobleman, this aristocrat born into Russia's ruling class, this critic who condemns all governments and churches, money, courts of justice, ownership of property, and yet who owned an estate worth five hundred thousand dollars, and believed in the theories of Henry George. Though it was not his own fault that he did not rid himself of it all, and give it to the poor peasants. There was something in him so kind, so naive, so obstinate. If we criticise him for vagaries and aberrations in his teachings, for denying himself so unnecessarily, for making the externals of religion so bare and severe, we should remember that although it may be Tolstoi contra munda there is room in the world for such a man. We cannot withhold a feeling of admiration for the heroism, boldness and courage of the man who could ring out such striking appeals against tyranny, injustice, oppression and hypocrisy in religion. We count it a pleasure and profit to have read his books, and to have gathered from them his message to the world. We have accepted what we could but for the reason that our reservations still outnumber our affirmations, we cannot be fully counted a disciple of Tolstoi.

> "The letter fails, and systems fall,
> And every symbol wanes;
> The Spirit over-brooding all
> Eternal love remains."

New Kensington, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

CHRIST'S PERSONAL PRESENCE.

BY REV. LEANDER KEYSER, D.D.

During the last Pentecostal season many things were said about "Christ's going away and the Holy Spirit coming in His stead." It may be well now to make a restatement of the Biblical and Lutheran doctrine of the real and personal presence of our Lord. After all the years of Lutheran teaching, it is a little surprising to find so many writers and speakers treating Christ as if He were present in the world, not personally, but only by proxy—that is, by and through the Holy Spirit.

Note the following quotation: "It is through the Spirit that Christ keeps His promise of being with us even to the end of the world. Personally, He is no longer present; we cannot see or hear or touch Him; but His power is present in the hearts of believers through the Spirit that comes in the Word and the Sacrament."

The writer's meaning may be correct, but his mode of expression is very faulty, and seems to indicate a hazy conception of the person of Christ. Surely our Lutheran confessions nowhere teach that the Holy Spirit *mediates the presence* of Christ; nor do we believe that the Sacred Writings uphold such a doctrine. In as comprehensive a view as possible let us look at the Biblical teaching on the person and presence of Christ.

It is true that Christ does in several places speak about "going away." What He meant by this mode of expression will be explained later. Just now we are concerned to note that He speaks just as clearly and positively about "coming again." He says, "I will not leave you comfortless (bereaved); I will come to you." Let it be observed that He says "I." Nor does He intimate that He will come through the mediation of another. "*I* will come to you." Again He says: "In that day (the day of the Spirit's coming) ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." This declaration points explicitly to the personal presence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Then He adds: "He that hath my com-

mandments and keepeth them he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and *I* will love Him and will *manifest myself* unto him..... If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and *we* will come unto him, and *make our abode* with him." The personal presence of both the Father and the Son is taught in the foregoing passage. Afterward our Lord adds these most significant words, which should be pondered: "Ye have heard how I said to you, I go away, and I come unto you. If ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced because I go unto the Father; for the Father is greater than I." (The Father, being all divine, was greater than Christ in the time and state of His humiliation; therefore in His humanity He would ascend to the Father to be glorified, and thus filled with all the fullness of God, so that He (Christ), in both His humanity and divinity, might be transcendent and therefore immanent and ubiquitous. Was not that reason enough to make the disciples rejoice?) At another place He says, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." At still another place, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there will I be in the midst of them." The apostle Paul teaches the same truth when he says, "Christ in you the hope of glory." Also in the great passage, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

Now note, all these statements indicate Christ's real and personal presence. He says "I." Never once does He give the impression that He will be present through the Holy Spirit or by proxy, but always in His own person. When He speaks of the coming and abiding presence of the Spirit, He does not intimate that He (the Spirit) is coming to take His place, but is coming in addition to the personal presence of the Christ. Therefore He promises, "I will send you *another* comforter."

Then what does Christ mean by "going away?" For He does say plainly, "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go, I will send Him unto you." The whole truth is that Christ will go away, then will come again and be an abiding, never-failing presence. How can these things be? This, we think, is the explanation: By His going away He means departing from the physical, sensuous, visible, and merely local realm and going back into the invisible and divine realm from which He descend-

ed when He came forth from the Father. However, to go back into the invisible realm does not mean absence; it simply means departure in one form and manner to come again and be graciously present in another and a superior form and manner. And what is the new form in which the Christ is present? It is the glorified form.

Observe the whole inspiring teaching of God's Word. So far as Christ's humanity was concerned He did depart, for He ascended to the right hand of God and was glorified, His human nature being filled with all the power and grace and glory of the divine nature, so that the apostle could say, "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." What a profound saying! Add to it this statement of Paul (Eph. 4:10): "He that descended is the same also that ascended *far above all heavens,* that He might *fill all things.*" The meaning of it is that Christ in His whole theanthropic person ascended above and beyond time and space, so that He, in His whole human-divine nature, might be present everywhere. That is, He became transcendent that He might become immanent. Therefore the Bible teaches the immanence of Christ in His whole glorified person. Thus it was necessary that He, in His human nature, should "go away," that is, ascend above the limitations of time and space into the transcendent sphere, in order that His human nature as well as His divine nature, might become transcendent, and thereby become immanent and ubiquitous. This is what He must mean, then, when He says He will "come again" and will be "with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Only by ascending and becoming transcendent could He be with His people everywhere at the same time, and that in His own right and person, and not in the person of another member of the Holy Trinity.

What is meant, then, by His "*sending* the Holy Spirit?" And why did He intimate that, if He did not go away, the Spirit would not come? This is the evident meaning: First, as to the "sending;" only after Christ had ascended above all heavens—that is, into the transcendent realm—could He send the Holy Spirit, in full redeeming power, into the realm of time and space to abide with the disciples forever. Therefore the "sending" means the Spirit's coming from the Father and the glorified Son into the human and local realm. Secondly, it was only after the Son was glorified that the Holy Spirit could

take of the fullness of redemptive grace from the Son and bring it to His people. For the Spirit to have come before Christ's transcendent glorification would have been premature; would have been to come before He was clothed with all redeeming power; before He was fully equipped for His functional work of regenerating and illuminating and witnessing to Christ's grace and power within the human heart. As our Lord says, it is part of the Spirit's office to "take of the things of Christ and show them" to the disciples. This the Spirit could do only after Christ had carried His humanity to perfect victory and glory. Had the Spirit come prior to the ascension of Christ, He could have brought only the truths and graces of divinity to His people on the earth, and therefore His testimony in the heart would not have been clear for the incarnate Son of God; but coming, as He did, after Christ's ascension and glorification, the Spirit brings the power and grace of the Redeemer's triumphant and glorified humanity to our hearts, and thus His witness is clear for the whole Christ.

What, then, is the complete teaching of the Scriptures as to the divine presence? Surely that the whole blessed Trinity is present with us, really and truly present, and each member in His own right and person. For Christ teaches that the Holy Spirit will be given to abide forever; no less clearly does He teach that He Himself will be present: and He also says that both He and the Father will come to His believing disciples and will make their abode with them. Where one person of the Godhead is the others are. If that were not so, there would be a disrupted Trinity—a tritheism instead of a tri-unity. Moreover, Christ must be present, not in His divine nature only, but also in His glorified human nature, or else we should have a divided Christ. But the Bible teaches that we are saved and comforted by the presence of the undivided Trinity and the undivided Christ. All of which is a profound truth and a blessed consolation.

Now, all we need to do is to study our Lutheran confessions and theologies to discern that they teach this same high and holy Biblical view of the person of Christ. Take several quotations from the Formula of Concord, whose comprehensive teaching on this doctrine has never been surpassed. We quote from page 518 of Jacobs' edition of the Book of Concord:

"Hence we believe, teach and confess that the Son of Man is really, that is, in deed and in truth, exalted, according to His human nature, to the right hand of the almighty majesty and power of God, because He was assumed into God when He was conceived of the Holy Ghost in His mother's womb, and His human nature was personally united with the Son of the Highest."

"This majesty, according to the personal union, He always had; and yet, in the state of His humiliation, He abstained from it, and on this account truly grew in all wisdom and favor with God and men; therefore He exercised this majesty, not always, but when it pleased Him; until, after His resurrection, He entirely laid aside the form of a servant, and not the nature, and was established in the full use, manifestation and declaration of the divine majesty, and thus entered into His glory (Phil. 2:6. sq.); so that now, not only as God, but also as man, He knows all things, can do all things, is present with all creatures, and has, under His feet and in His hands, everything that is in heaven and on earth and under the earth, as He Himself testifies (Matt. 28:18; John 13:3): 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' And St. Paul says (Eph. 4:10): 'He ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.' Everywhere present, He can exercise this His power, and to Him everything is possible and everything known.

"Hence, being present, He is able, and to Him it is very easy to impart His true body and blood in the Holy Supper, not according to the mode and property of the human nature, but according to the mode and property of the right hand of God; as Dr. Luther says in our Christian Faith for Children, which presence is not earthly or Capernaitic: nevertheless it is true and substantial, as the words of His testament sound: "This is, *is*, is my body,' etc.'"

From page 639 we quote again: "But we hold that by these words (the teaching of Holy Scripture) the majesty of the man Christ is declared, which Christ has received according to His humanity, at the right hand of the majesty and power of God—namely, that He also, according to His assumed human nature and with the same, can be and is present where He will, and especially that in His church and congregation on earth, as Mediator, Head, King, and High Priest. He is not half present, or there is only the half of Him present, but the entire person of

Christ is present, to which two natures belong, the divine and the human; not only according to His divinity, but also according to and with His assumed human nature, by which He is our brother and we are flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone. For the certain assurance and confirmation of this, He has instituted His Holy Supper, that also according to our nature, by which He has flesh and blood, He will be with us, and in us dwell and be efficacious."

Quotations from both Luther and the Formula of Concord might be multiplied, but those given are clear and decisive. In all our great theologies, like those of Schmid, Martensen, Frank, and Luthardt, the same high and holy doctrine of Christ's person is taught. A faithful study of the Lutheran doctrine of the "communicatio idiomatum" will rectify any errors that may be held relative to the person of our Lord and His real immanence in the world. Indeed, it stands to reason that, if our humanity is to be redeemed and saved, it must be done by a real and vital contact with the resurrected and glorified humanity of our Lord, the true Federal Head of the race. This is what our Saviour meant when He said (John 6:54-56): "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him." This eating and drinking is effected by the believer's mystical union with the glorified incarnate Redeemer.

The whole doctrine of the divine presence might be stated thus: The Father is present as Preserver and gracious heavenly Parent and eternal Source of grace. The Holy Spirit is present to awaken the sinner into life by His regenerating touch at the very center of man's personality, which is the human spirit, which must be revived and awakened in order to take hold upon redeeming grace. Then Christ in His whole theanthropic person is present, first, to pour out or baptize with the Spirit; second, to be the living Saviour, Friend. Companion, Sympathizer and Nourisher of the regenerated believer. All told, the contact of the Holy Trinity with the man of faith is direct, vital, constant, inspiring and redemptive. The believer is richly blessed. He is no orphan; he has a living, present Father. He cannot be lost; he has a living, present Saviour. He cannot be

"dead in trespass and sins;" he has a living, present Regenerator. The mystical union, begun by the spiritual birth by the Spirit, is a vital union with the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

EXPOSITION OF LENT[1]

BY REV. A. D. POTTS, D.D., PH.D.

Lent, in a general and unrestricted sense, dates its origin quite far back in the Christian era. From an ecclesiastical standpoint it takes its rise in both the Greek and Latin Churches from about the fourth century.

While the season of keeping a fast before Easter was more or less observed in that age, still we find a lack of uniformity in the practices of the different adherents. Some observers of the fast felt only the necessity of keeping one day, while others deemed it obligatory to keep two or more days. In the opinion of a Latin writer on the subject, it was incumbent on Christians to keep the fast religiously for a period covering the exact time that "the bridegroom was taken away from them." But even in the light of such a conception the practice was subject to variations; no consensus of opinion prevailed. Leo I laid stress on the 40 day period and claimed apostolic sanction for his interpretation. Such, indeed, were the divergent and unsettled views up till nearly the close of the eighth century. The manner of observing Lent in those early days was admissible of nearly as great a latitude as was the length of time considered necessary to a proper fulfilment of the same. That a certain degree of strictness in the observance was deemed essential to ecclesiastical life and progress, is a fact that can be gleaned from the special regulations exacted.

The catalogue embraced the following:

"Perfect abstinence from all food every fasting day until evening is in theory, at least, required, and it has been considered desirable that the public worship with sermon should be attended daily, with frequent communion, especially on Saturday and Sunday; public amusements, especially stage plays, are prohibited, and the celebration of the religious festivals, as also of

1. Read at the spring session of the Northeast Conference of the Alleghany Synod at Union Church in Huntingdon county, Pa., and furnished for publication in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY by a unanimous vote of the brethren.

birthdays and marriages, is held undesirable; and increased diligence in almsgiving and deeds of charity is enjoined."

Having noted these general facts relative to the subject, it shall be my purpose to deal more particularly with Lent as viewed from a Lutheran standpoint. That the season is one of serious magnitude all sober-minded persons will readily admit, and that its true observance by our church members is a solemn and imperative duty must be accepted as a foregone conclusion.

The period in our regular church year brings us very closely in touch with the Passion life of our dear Lord, and reveals to us, in the most feeling manner, the agony of Him who endured all things that His loyal and sincere followers might be spared much suffering, and died triumphantly that men might have life more abundantly.

The word Lent, in itself, means spring.

As such, the season always comes in the spring of the year. As an interchangeable term, or one synonymous with it, we sometimes speak of the suffering period as the Passion-Season.

Passion, here, means suffering. The idea of a fast was connected with it. Abstinence from food was a stern requirement. The exact time embraced was seven weeks prior to Easter, and properly began with Ash Wednesday.

Ash Wednesday, as a starting point in Lent, was historically connected with the practice in vogue in Old Testament times when the priests sprinkled ashes upon the heads of the people, repeating the words, "Remember that thou art dust and ashes." This practice, at once, reminded the observers of the necessity of a condition of humility. Such a conception was not a foreign thought in the mind of our dear Lord who was entering upon one of the most lowly periods in His history from the manger to the grave.

It pointed back to the utterance of the prophet Isaiah who said, "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed."

Jesus, undoubtedly, realized the significant import of that prophetic utterance when He, having called together His twelve disciples, predicted His passion experience in these memorable worns: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all the things

that are uttered by the prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished. For He shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on; and they shall scourge Him and put Him to death: and the third day He shall rise again."

What harmony between the Old and New Testaments on this point! Both prophesies were minutely and literally fulfilled.

The Lamb without spot or blemish was ready to be offered. The awful crisis was at hand.

He who knew no sin was tasting sin for every man. However severe the ordeal, He faced it all. "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearers, so He opened not His mouth: In His humiliation His judgment was taken away: and who shall declare His generation? for His life is taken from the earth." To particularize, I shall from this point proceed to discuss the theme synoptically by taking up in order the six Sundays constituting the Passion-Season, and then note the bearing that their true interpretations have on the life and character of the sincere participant.

According to the Lutheran division of the Lenten season, we denominate the six Sundays as follows: Invocavit, Reminiscere, Oculi, Laetere, Judica, and Palmarum.

While I have stated that the Lenten season properly begins with Ash Wednesday, still it may not be irrelevant to our subject to specify the Scripture lesson for the previous Sunday as an accurate and fitting introduction to the matter to be treated under the six Sundays of Lent proper.

Luke, in this particular lesson, truly gives us a clue to the entire history that must engage our attention. He furnishes us with the account of blind Bartimaeus who, though devoid of natural vision, yet possessed a sense of sight that enabled him to recognize the Passion Saviour.

We thank God that the blind man's ears were not dulled. He heard the commotion about him, and when he inquired as to its meaning, we are told that the crowd answered him by saying, "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by." Ah! indeed, that meant much to an anxious and needy soul.

Jesus passing by, and to what end?

Yes, passing by on His way to Jerusalem to suffer and die. What had that to do with a blind man at the wayside? What,

I ask, if not an opportunity to know the Lord of life and glory? His own words confirm the truthfulness of the matter. Actuated by faith that will not shrink at the sight of poverty or woe, he cried, saying, "Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me."

The thoughtful and compassionate Saviour said to the blind petitioner, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" The blind man is quick to make his request for he knew what he needed, and that Jesus could bestow the favor. He said, "Lord, that I may receive my sight." The answer and the cure are at once given by the Saviour who says: "Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee."

And oh! the marvelous result. The blind man received his sight, and the wonder-working Jesus received the merited glory. And in every observance of the Lenten season the figure repeats itself. It foreshadows the need of sinners in calling upon the dear Lord and the ready deliverance that comes to immortal souls.

Jesus passing by in His journey of grace will stop to heal or take away our spiritual blindness if we only call upon Him, trust in Him, and give Him the glory due Him. Such close communion comes in our Lenten experiences. Let us, as contrite ones, say, "Sirs, we would see Jesus." When we are the neediest, Jesus is readiest to help.

In Him is infinite power and unending mercy. He will save unto the uttermost all that call upon Him in faith and humility. Before Him, too, the Devil trembles and the cohorts of hell flee.

This thought prepares us for the consideration of:

1. The First Sunday in Lent. (Invocavit).

The Gospel account supporting it is found in Matt. iv:1-11. In our study of the lesson we are brought face to face with one of the most touching episodes in the life of our dear Lord.

We have here, as principals in a tremendous conflict, the King of kings and the Arch-enemy of souls. Here we have Satan, with all the machinations of the infernal pit, trying might and main to despoil God's well-beloved Son.

In doing so he appeals to human nature through its wants as though physical necessities well met would prove to be the summum bonum of terrestrial life. The Devil saw fit to invert the logical order of sequence in his attack on Jesus.

His aim was to gain a victory over Christ by getting Him to work a miracle on stone to meet the pangs of bodily hunger. That the Devil was strategic in this instance must be admitted.

Had Christ complied in this particular, it would have been comparatively easy for Satan to succeed in the remaining trials to be made.

What Satan planned first in order, was bread, then trust, and then worship. Such was his schedule. Christ, however, invoked the authority of the Old Testament teaching to defeat His assailant.

He appealed to Deuteronomy, time and again, in His encounters with the Prince of Darkness. Christ showed the Devil that the order outlined in the present temptation was unscriptural.

The Word of God puts the Devil's first would-be test last, and his last requirement first.

The divine order is: *worship, trust, bread.*

It is written, "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness: and all these things shall be added unto you." The Saviour's ready use of the Word of God throughout the entire temptation proved His familiarity with that Word and showed that His life was to be rounded out not by instantaneous acquiescence in the Devil's strategy, but by following conditions eternally fixed by "Thus saith the Lord."

In other words, Christ conquered Satan through the acknowledged authority of the Scriptures.

His quotations from Moses proved conclusively that man, after all, does not live by bread alone, however called into requisition, "but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

Christ, having resorted to such a method, easily defeated His wary antagonist. It is recorded, "Then the Devil leaveth Him." The victory was not only marvelous, but signally complete.

In man's conflict with the same satanic agency, nothing will serve him so well as the adroitness to invoke the conquering power of the Word of God.

Invoke the Word! It brought Christ's victory, and it will bring yours. It is mighty and will prevail. I will now notice:

2. The Second Sunday in Lent. (Reminiscere).

The Gospel basis, in this instance, is Matt. xv:21-28. Here,

as in our notice of the preceding lesson, Satan plays a conspicuous part.

He gets not only near humanity, but into it. He takes possession of a young girl and torments her grievously. How he gained possession we are not told. As long, however, as the damsel is under his influence she is neither well by nature, nor comfortable by grace.

But what is of grave moment in this connection is the fact the girl's mother is no small sufferer because of her daughter's predicament. Sympathy, deep and strong, must pervade the mother's nature when she is made to endure the privations and discomforts that hold her child in misery's chains. Sin, we might justly say, is contagious. It strives to embrace the major number rather than the minor one.

The sympathizing mother, in this instance, from maternal and natural bonds, enters deeply into her daughter's woes. The mother-heart is pained in the extreme and resolves to obtain help, not from the medical fraternity, but from the great Physician, who has at His command the true balm of Gilead. This forces through my mind a momentous thought. It makes me think of a real devil. Indeed, I believe in a personal devil, and I further believe that only a personal Christ can exorcise a personal devil.

Evil, to my mind, is no less an entity than is right or good. The evil in this case that made the mother full of sorrow and vexation was from the same source as that which made her child suffer. The startling fact was, like mother, like child. But why, it may be asked, did the mother suffer so intensely in this particular?

Why, if not because of a mother's love? We are told that it is the very "essence of all true love to suffer with and for the object of its love." What an application to the condition of needy souls does this mother-love teach us of Christ's love for sinful men and women?

The immaculate Jesus endured the acme of suffering in our behalf. It was love supreme on His part that induced Him to tread the wine-press alone, and to endure the agonies of dark Gethsemane and the cruel tortures of Calvary.

"He first loved us, and gave Himself for us." What the

woman of Canaan asked the blessed Master for herself, we must beseech Him to grant unto us.

She said, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David." The suffering Saviour alone can help and save the suffering sinner. Her plaint, "Lord, help me," touched the Saviour's loving heart, and He said, "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that hour." So also was the mother. A similar petition must be ours in our sad plight, occasioned by sin's destructive ways. If man will only recognize THE CHRIST of life and glory, if he will only evidence to a recognition of Christ's compasionate love for mankind, if he will only appropriate Christ's grace offered through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and if he will only seek humbly, faithfully and believingly nothing but Christ's will, it shall be well with him in both time and eternity.

A Reminiscere Sunday teaches us that if we call upon the Lord while He is near, doubting nothing, we shall obtain mercy. The prophet Isaiah said, "Trust ye in the Lord forever: for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength."

The Psalmist David gave a similar injunction when he said, "Trust in the Lord and do good: so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed. Delight thyself also in the Lord: and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart.

Commit thy ways unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass.

And He shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday."

Let us now notice:

3. The Third Sunday in Lent. (Oculi).

The foundation on which this consideration rests is found in Luke xi:14-28. Here, too, as in previous activities of our Lord, do we find the Evil One an opposing factor. In the first encounter Satan assailed our Lord directly, but in the second he choose a young girl to be possessed of him and proved himself to be her grievous tormentor. In this third instance, we find that Satan tenants himself once more in a human being and works great detriment to the person by rendering him dumb. The word EXIT had scarcely fallen from the Saviour's lips before a mighty change was wrought in the unhappy victim for his relief. The dumb immediately regained his power of speech

and used the same in witnessing to the wonder-working power of the Son of God.

But, the spirit of fault-finding was ready to operate at the same time. While some of the people wondered at the marvelous change so instantaneously wrought, still they thought it strange that He who proclaimed Himself to be the Messiah should not give a more elaborate demonstration of His Messiahship. Others, who had witnessed the same gracious work of Christ, were ready to criticise Him, and even went so far as to attribute to Him an alliance with Beelzebub the prince of devils. To have put Christ in league with an ordinary devil, had there been such, would have been base and nefarious enough, but when His critics meant to show that Christ and Beelzebub were in a hellish partnership the matter assumed a gravity that foreboded no little degree of wickedness. It, however, took but a moment for Christ to dislodge such illogical arguments and to distinctly show that Satan arrayed against Satan was not only a preposterous proposition to set on foot, but one that was contrary to the whole law of reasoning. If a house divided against itself could not stand, so it would follow, as a natural sequence, Christ declared, that a devil fighting a devil could not bring about such salutary results. The whole lesson, with its striking delineations, at once, shows us Christ's supremacy and Satan's crushing defeat.

Christ's kingdom must advance and finally stand. The Devil's kingdom, before the relentless charge of Christ's forces, must dwindle and fall.

Christ's victory whether over a subaltern, or even Beelzebub himself, is complete and final.

It takes away from the Devil all the armor in which he trusted. It not only breaks the spear, but crushes the head of the foe.

It has been said, "The Devil is a confident adversary; he trusts to his armor, as Pharoah to his rivers; but Christ disarms him. When the power of sin and corruption in the soul is broken, when the mistakes are rectified, the eyes opened, the heart humbled and changed, and made serious and spiritual, then Satan's armor is taken away."

The Despoiler is despoiled, and the suffering Saviour and His kingdom are gloriously triumphant. Sin must be eliminated from the heart and life, and grace, truth, and righteousness must

dwell therein. Where Christ and His sublime truth dwell, the Devil soon quits his palace.

He does not always wait to be thrust out, but, as in the case of the dumb man, he elects to go out.

Man, in his unregenerate state, is with Satan, and against Christ. The Saviour said, "He that is not with Me, is against Me: and he that gathereth not with Me, scattereth abroad."

God and man reconciled is victory over hell and Satan. Our next consideration is:

4. The Fourth Sunday in Lent. (Laetare).

The corresponding gospel is found in John vi:1-15. In the development of this topic we are confronted by the stern truth that mankind, in its ruined and alienated state, seeks material things to the exclusion of spiritual gifts.

The old story of loaves and fishes repeats itself over and over again. The earthly, with its fluctuations and transitory pleasures, clings to men in their daily experiences. Christ realized this most painfully in His day, and was ready to rebuke the misguided devotees. He said to the masses, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek Me not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed." By way of supplement, He added the significant words, "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger: he that believeth on Me shall never thirst."

He also said, "I am that bread which came down from heaven." How truly must the heart rejoice when it perceives that God's well-beloved Son gave up His life in death that thousands and tens of thousands of soul-an-hungered ones might have the Bread of Life. The cup of joy is made to everflow when immortal souls realize that Jesus came to "furnish the bread for the soul, the meat that perisheth not, the life eternal, heaven for this poor unheavenly world." Those, we believe, who look simply to Christ for material blessings will, in the end, be sad, but those who come to Him for spiritual nourishment will be eternally happy and rich. Soul-life needs soul-food, and 'tis Jesus alone who can supply the essential want. David said, "Our soul waiteth for the Lord: He is our help and shield. For

our heart shall rejoice in Him, because we have trusted in His holy name. Let Thy mercy, O Lord, be upon us, according as we hope in Thee."

We now come to consider:

5. The Fifth Sunday in Lent. (Judica).

The Gospel lesson for this Sunday is found in John viii:6-59. Here, again, we are cognizant of the fact that not only devils, but men, inspired by devilish motives, love to taunt and deride the Son of God. In His day it was a common thing to pile the most abusive epithets upon the sacred head of the Lord Jesus Christ. Because He cut to the quick, with the sword of the Spirit, His avowed enemies, the most rancorous abuse shot its arrows into His unblemished life.

Never, in the history of the world, was anyone so bitterly and unjustly maligned as the innocent Saviour. As the night brings out the stars, so also did unwarranted accusations on the part of Christ's foes bring Him more and more to the notice of seeking souls. The jeers of His assailants proved in turn to be tributes to His matchless and spotless character. Because Christ told the Jews of their alienation from the commonwealth of true Israel, they sought to brand Him as an enemy to His race. They stigmatized Him as such when they said, "Thou art a Samaritan."

Judica Sunday tells who and what Christ is.

It accounts accurately for His personality and sinless life. Jesus told the scoffing Jews of His day that He was neither a Samaritan nor the dwelling place of a devil. He further said as to the eternity of His existence, "Before Abraham was, I am." This citation was too much for them and it sorely angered them. To show the volume of their animosity it is said, "Then took they up stones to cast at Him."

But all this shameful treatment did not in the least disconcert the adorable Lord.

He employed the ascending scale of argument and made stronger and stronger allegations in His behalf. He declares not only His unique character to be well established by the wonderful works wrought in their presence, but pointedly asserts an unbroken equality with the Creator of heaven and earth. Indeed, He considers it not robbery to be equal with God, and proves His true relationship by declaring, "I and my Father are-

one." He told His accusers plainly that they misjudged Him and that they would be called to account for their injustice. He threw the judicial act upon the heart of His Father when He said, "And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth." The question comes home solemnly to all of us in these words, "What think ye of Christ?" We must decide the momentous interrogation sooner or later.

The bliss or woe of our eternity depends on the solution of the vital problem. Not only must the Bible tell us who Christ is, but we, as inheritors of eternal life, are called upon to give a reason for the faith and hope within us.

We are men, and Christ asks, "Whom do men say that I am?" In helping to put the Jews to shame who said that Christ was a Samaritan, let us, in the language of Peter, say, "Thou art the Christ: the Son of the living God," and declare with Thomas, "My Lord, and my God." We must proclaim Him to be our Christ. Indeed, He is a personal Christ; He is each man's Christ. "The tree of life stands in the middle of the garden that all may have equal access to it. Is this universal Christ yours: thine? Take Him for yours and you will find that each who possesses Him, possesses Him altogether, and none hinders the other in his full enjoyment of the bread of God which came down from heaven." We now notice:

6. The Sixth Sunday in Lent. (Palmarum).

The Gospel teaching in this instance is recorded in Matt. xxi: 1-9. Palmarum Sunday properly begins the Holy or Passion week of our Lord's closing earthly history. At this time He was nearing some of the most momentous events the world ever heard of. Having begun His memorable journey to Jerusalem, according to our Lenten chronology, we find Him nigh unto that city wherein should be enacted the culminating features of His terrestrial life. As He approached His earthly destiny, He appears to us as the same lowly Jesus of the past. His humiliation is marked by the absence of any worldly glamour or national ostentation. The choosing of an ass, a lowly beast of burden, was entirely in keeping with His plain and unpretentious character.

Men of state and warriors could select prancing horses on which to appear in national pageantry, or ride into fierce battles,

but Jesus, the mightiest conqueror of the ages, was satisfied with what was deemed an almost despised mode of travel.

Had He so elected He could have chosen a cherub to carry Him into the kingly city, or had He asserted His eternal prerogative of power He might have ridden on the very heavens, but, as our Immanuel, He saw fit to make His triumphal entry on a borrowed ass. Here, He evidently teaches men the noble lesson of true contentment in what they can command, and sets aside preconceived notions of coveted notoriety. If He was pleased to adapt Himself to humble surroundings and to use apparently despised facilities in order to accomplish His fixed purpose, so also must His zealous followers be content in whatsoever conditions they find themselves, even amid the blandishments of their useful lives. The borrowed ass marked the special feature in His eventful life known as poverty.

St. Paul emphasized this truth when he said, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though He was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich." It has been said, "They that live on borrowing, live on sorrowing." Truly, Christ was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.

But His humiliation was, after all, really a stepping stone to His exaltation. In this, He has left us an example. By virtue of our condition through the fall of the human race, we must realize our poverty in things that make for our eternal welfare. Poverty in the realm of grace reveals to us our need of grace.

Devoid of inherent righteousness, we must be ready to take over Christ's imputed righteousness.

Even now, we must humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God's rulings, so as to be exalted in the coming time to His right hand in glory

Humiliating, indeed, as Christ's entry into Jerusalem was, because of His chosen mode of ingress it was nevertheless distinguished by certain attendant circumstances that made it signally triumphant. The honor conferred upon Him by the multitudes casting their garments and strewing palm branches in His way, and in shouting "Hosanna to the Son of David," gave prominence and emphasis to the declaration, "Vox populi, Vox Dei."

If the multitudes in Christ's time honored Him by their out-

ward demonstrations, as already noted, does it not become us, in an age of spiritual enlightenment and privileges, to crown Him the Lord of all by "welcoming Him, His grace, and His Gospel into our hearts?" It surely can be no mean procedure on our part to strew the palm branches of love, fidelity, and service in Christ's pathway through this wilderness world of sin when we are assured that He will, in His kingdom of glory, be pleased to place crowns of diadems on our heads and palms of victory in our hands.

In concluding our very interesting and instructive subject, it occurs to me that no Church in Christendom to-day has a higher purer, and truer conception of Lent than the Lutheran Church.

She ever stands squarely on the fundamental truths underlying the whole subject matter, and continually guards against any innovations that would detract from a proper observance of so sacred a season. It has been her pleasure and duty to conserve the gracious doctrine embodied in the teachings of God's Word in connection with this particular period of our Church Year.

She accentuates most distinctly the truth that a true keeping of the Lenten season must logically deepen spiritual life on the part of her members. Indeed, in view of her attitude on this matter, it is not saying too much when we declare that Protestantism owes the Lutheran Church an everlasting debt of gratitude and just recognition on account of her determination to keep the ecclesiastical cycle from being merged into a broad and conspicuous Revivalism, on the one hand, or a coarse Externalism, on the other hand.

The Saviour's journey to the cross was too solemn and soul-touching a period in His life to allow a slipshod or go-as-you-please observance of the facts connected with it to minimize the deep sacrificial and redemptive lessons to be taught.

I, for one, cannot tolerate the popular "evangelistic," or revivalistic tendency of our day in some places to push the time-honored evangelical view of Lent into the background. Neither can I accept the practice of Romanism, or blatant Ritualism with any less degree of denunciation.

The season is really one of too great seriousness, solemnity and far-reaching benefits to have it dragged in the mire of rabid rationalism and mere ceremonialism. The spiritual rather than the ethical must take the precedence and go on till it eventuates

in the ready acceptance of Christ's terrible sufferings and meritorious death as the only medium of mankind's redemption.

Sin and grace, in this instance, stand in near relationship. "Two main pillars support the majestic temple of divine revelation, and they are the sin of man and the grace of God."

Because sin has wrought its fearful havoc among the ranks of men, does the necessity of grace follow. The poor sinner, being heavily weighted with his sorrow for sin, and being hungry and thirsty for the bread and water of eternal life, finds himself spiritually refreshed by entering willingly into the conditions that God has made possible for him, in and through His loving plan of salvation. Thus it was that I saw fit to take up so fully and to elaborate so largely the corresponding Scripture lessons in connection with the six successive Sundays belonging to the Lenten season. "It is Lent's passion that inspires the Christian's response. Let us love Him who first loved us.....Jesus will teach us how to live and how to die,—yes, and how to rise again that we may inherit eternal life."

How markedly opposed, then, to the idea that Lent is a season of rest and recuperation, is our conception of Lent as a period of *spiritual refreshment.* Recently I read some words in one of our great city papers that made me wonder whether we were to so forget the true idea of Lent as to find no other use for it save the matter of rest and recuperation. That paper, in explaining the need of Lent, saw fit to say that Lent was "almost as necessary to the continued vitality of society as the one day in seven."

Such a low and distorted view of the observance of the Lenten season most assuredly emphasizes the human side of the individual and allows man's spiritual nature to get along as best it can. Poor, tired humanity that has been for a time in the whirl of society's maze and feels itself quite weary from long engagements in social functions must, according to this pseudo and modern conception of Lent, have the precious hours of the blessed Passion Season of our dear Lord for mere respite from toil and the chances of recuperation.

Alas! what a travesty upon the highest ideal of true life, as well as upon that portion of time commemorative of the dear Saviour's sad hours spent in going up to Jerusalem to meet His awful doom.

We earnestly beseech God to keep us from entertaining such a base notion and from practicing such a vain and shameful delusion.

If the Lenten season savors of anything in the line of rest, it must be of that kind that the sincere and contrite sinner enjoys and receives when, weary of sin's load, he heeds the blessed Saviour's invitation which says, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me: for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest for your souls." Thus, then, we observe that the Lenten season properly and sincerely kept is a time of rich and gracious opportunities.

Indeed, they are golden opportunities to bring men to a profound knowledge of their sins and to show them the only way of escape. It has been well said in commenting upon our Lenten opportunities that "one must be a better Christian for the rest of the year, if one, during the Lenten time, will enrich his intelligence with Christian truth, will invigorate his will by sturdy living, will fire his heart with heavenly love."

We may in the silence of the closet, get nearer to our heavenly Father; we may understand more deeply, the Passion of Jesus; we may in daily prayer and service, consecrate our thoughts, our affections, and our deeds to Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Thus we may grow into His image.'" What an incentive to correct living does the season furnish! "By faithfulness in Lenten duties we gather strength and grace to go on to better things, when the light of Easter morning breaks through the mists, and the Sunshine of Eternal Hope falls upon an empty tomb."

As a fitting peroration to all that I have said on the subject assigned me, I would like to quote the following poem on Lent.

"Now, in the passage of the year,
Cometh the time to Christians dear,
Time to reflect, confess, repent—
The hallowed forty days of Lent.

My Saviour by the Spirit driven,
Used these dear days in thoughts on heaven,
Wrung Truth from dreary desert sand,
Conquered my foe with dauntless hand.

Thus Jesus kept His Lent, and then
Age after age of holy men
Have used thee, Oh dear season blest!
Their prayers have made, their sins confessed.

And shall not I observe these days
And turn from earth awhile my gaze?
Christ and the Church say 'Heed! Repent!'
I'll keep—as Jesus did—my Lent.'"

Petersburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

KARL MARX.

BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

Professor Vablen has rightly said: "The socialism that inspires hopes and fears to-day is of the school of Marx. No one is seriously apprehensive of any other so-called socialistic movement, and no one is seriously concerned to criticise or refute the doctrines set forth by any other school of 'Socialists.'" John Spargo who has given us the first adequate biography of Marx says, "In the great European countries where Socialism is a power politically, the movement is almost wholly dominated and inspired by the thought and deed of Marx. In the United States, where there is a growing Socialistic movement which is generally recognized as being much bigger and stronger than its political manifestation, Socialism and Marxism are synonomous. In China and Japan the works of Marx are eagerly read and studied by those who challenge the existing order and who dream of change. In Australia Marxian shibboleths are inscribed upon the red-banners of a discontented proletariat. In Africa there are Karl Marx clubs, from which eminate the spirit of revolution."

The personality and work of such a man, then, must have an interest for all students of social and political life.

His work *Das Kapital* is known by many, the man himself is not only slightly known but has been grossly misrepresented. This paper does not pretend to be more than a compilation, often using the very words of Mr. Spargo in his able presentation of the life of Marx. Marx's parents, Heinrich Marx and Henrietta Pressburg, lived at Trenis or Trier, as it is now called in the Province of the Rhine. It had been under Prussian rule but four years at the time of his birth, May 5th, 1818. The French Revolution had done much to break down mediaeval laws and customs. Heinrich Marx was a Jewish lawyer of social standing culture and force. He was intellectually a disciple of Voltaire Rousseau and Lessing. On the other hand he was a genuine Prussian patriot. This combination of liberalism and patriot-

ism prepared him for his change of faith. He deplored the revolutionary tendencies of his son in later days. When Karl was six years old his father embraced the Christian religion—at least he renounced Judaism as confining and anti-social in its attitude and claimed the large freedom and progressive spirit of German Protestantism. This step was not taken under compulsion as most of his biographers claim but out of his own free choice. Economically, the Jews, for the most part, remained after the Napoleonic regime what they were, a race of money lenders and usurers. Young Marx saw later that real liberty for the Jews was to be found in the emancipation of the Jew from himself, from this "practical Judaism"—from money and business. He agreed with Heine that Luther's battle hymn, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," was "the Marseillaise of the Reformation." Heinrich Marx was much more a typical Frenchman than a typical Jew. His mother was a simple, goodnatured soul of the domestic type with no particular intellectual gifts. Of all her children Karl alone manifested any special intelligence. He early manifested his intellectual aptness. His father died when Karl was twenty years of age. His mother lived until 1863 all through the worst period of her son's struggle. Every step he took in his revolutionary career filled her heart with pain and terror.

The grave lawyer father given to philosophic study was ready to give himself to the guidance and companionship of his promising boy. He discussed with Karl as soon as he was able to read the writings of Racine and Voltaire. Karl was a strong, imperious lad and required the conservative temper of his father to hold in check his own passionate, poetic, wayward temperament. Baron von Westphalen, half Scot, stood next in influence to the father of the spirited boy. Von Westphalen's charming daughter Jenny was the playmate of young Sophie Marx. From boyhood Karl was charmed by her winsome manner and devoted spirit. This early attachment ripened later into love and she finally became his courageous and devoted wife. Von Westphalen read Goethe, Lessing, Cervantes, Shakespeare and Dante to the eager and ambitious group of children making up the congenial household. Such was his early home training. No wonder then that he soon showed at school remarkable aptitude and interest in the studies usually set for young pupils. He was

full of fun, boistrous and with a vein of raillery and sarcasm that made him feared by his fellow schoolmates. But he was generous and daring of heart and won many friends. Handsome and beloved his mother called him her "fortune child." He was graduated from the Trier Gymnasium at sixteen years of age. His great capacity for planning extensive work with thoroughness and his marked superiority in Greek and Latin studies were noted in his school report.

With this equipment Karl Marx entered the University of Bonn. He had much difficulty in deciding upon a career. His mind leaned toward philosophic study and romantic literature. To please his father, however, he took up the study of jurisprudence. But his heart was not in his work and he had but indifferent success as a student of law. Indeed, he was a distinct disappointment to his father and Baron Von Westphalen whose own son Edgar, fifteen years older than Karl had made such a distinct success in public life and had become a Minister of State. Karl complained of the method of teaching at Bonn and plead to be sent to Berlin where jurisprudence was well taught. No doubt his burning love for Jenny Von Westphalen who was rich and four years older than Karl disturbed his mind and heart unfitting him for hard and continuous study. He returned home after a disappointing year at Bonn and then went to Berlin leaving his heart in Jenny's keeping. He had, of course, nothing to offer her in the way of support but he pushed his suit so hard that she yielded to his entreaties and they became engaged secretly. He was matriculated at Berlin in October, 1836, being then a little over eighteen years of age. The glory of the departed Hegel's career was still overshadowing the University. Ludwig Feuerbach had preached there the philosophy of humanitarian religion, whose *Wessen des Chrisenthums* profoundly influenced the development of Marx as may be seen from Engel's *Die Heilige Familie.* David Strauss, author of the Life of Jesus was another Berlin figure of power. But the influence of the philosophy of Hegel was undergoing a change. A new school of naturalist philosophers under the leadership of Alexander Von Humboldt had appeared. It was not long before the Hegelian metaphysic proved unsatisfactory to Marx and he sought in history and science the satisfaction of his mind. The truth is that he studied only a little more successfully at Berlin

than he did at Bonn looking upon jurisprudence as "a necessary evil." He was in an emotional and intellectual storm, for Jenny Von Westphalen had refused to correspond with him secretly. He wrote again and again to her but his impassioned letters provoked no reply. It was only through Sophie Marx that he learned of his sweetheart's condition. His father sympathized with both the young lovers and urged Karl to make a place for himself so that the "girl angel" might be free to respond to his son's impetuous desires. Jenny's parents finally consented to the engagement. He writes, "Give my best wishes to my sweet and beautiful Jenny. I have re-read her letter twelve times, and every time I find a new charm in it. It is in every respect, even in style, the finest letter I have ever received from a lady." He wrote poetry and planned the writing of a number of novels. He translated the *Germania* of Tacitus and Ovid's *Libri Tristium.* It was a period of storm and stress and his health broke down. The spiritual struggle was on and he determined to fight his way into the open and secure calm if possible. His father wrote in strong and commanding language that he should concentrate his mind upon something definite and practical or he would make shipwreck of life and crush the heart of his affianced bride. Karl went home at Easter and was present at his father's deathbed in 1838. Karl loved his father but they had come to a parting of the ways. He worshipped his father's memory but could not accept his point of view of life. In his agony of soul he turned once more to Hegel and joined himself to the "Young Hegelians" and found relief in new friendships and intellectual interests. Marx himself has said that the Young Helegians found that the dialectic method of Hegel, in order to be rationally employed, had to be turned upside down and placed upon a materialistic basis, and the saying fairly describes the aims and results of their work. Hegel's thought was essentially revolutionary. "All that is real is rational, and all that is rational is real." Hegel's doctrine, as applied to the Prussian State, did not mean that it was real and therefore rational, as implying approval of its existence. What it meant was that so long as it was *necessary* it was reasonable; that if a government exists in spite of what seems evil and unrational in its existence it is due to the faults in the subjects, which faults make its existence necessary. In other words, instead of approving the Prussian

State, Hegel virtually said, "Prussian government is as good as Prussians deserve." Hegel's philosophy gave recognition to the inevitability of the historic process of evolution, of growth. In the course of progress the reality of yesterday becomes the unreality of to-day or to-morrow; it looses its necessity, which is at once its right to existence and necessity.

Truth is not to be regarded as a fixed quantity, unchanging, to be conveniently compressed into formulae, but rather the process of knowledge itself. It will be seen later that the Hegelian philosophy was a necessary approach to Marxism. Still Hegel was far from reaching the modern Marxist point of view. Hegel was essentially an ideologist. According to his view, behind the great historical process and development is the Absolute Idea, existing from eternity, and the progression itself is simply the process of the Absolute.

The "Young Hagelians" combated this idea. Instead of regarding the logical forms as being due to a self-revealing Absolute, they regarded them as being due to human thought. Feuerbach boldly rejected Hegel's concept of the Absolute Idea and placed materialism on the throne again without circumlocution The senses, he declared to be the sole sources of knowledge. He revamped the bold materialism of the eighteenth century. Marx was greatly influenced by Feuerbach's thought but he saw that man's influence upon nations and society also had to be reckoned with. He could not swallow the dictum "Der Mensch ist was er isst"—that man is what he eats. But both Hegel and Feuerbach were permanent intellectual influences—steps if you please, to his own final philosophy. There can be no true understanding of Marx's political and economic beliefs, however, if we forget that his fundamental philosophy was materialistic. Bruno Bauer his friend, had removed to Bonn and kept urging young Marx to complete his examinations and secure the degree of doctor of philosophy. The desultory study of the Young Hegelian and his dislike of detail made it difficult for the young genius to concentrate his mind and time for such an end. But he pulled himself together and prepared a thesis upon the Epicurean philosophy which was both radical and controversial in its character. Bauer feared that the essay would not meet with any consideration at the hands of the Berlin faculty. His paper was sent finally to Jena and he received his diploma of doctor of philosophy from that university on Oct. 15th, 1841. Within

a few weeks of Marx's graduation Bauer's work, *Kritik der evangelischen Geschicte der Synoptiker,* appeared and precipitated a crisis. Eichhorn, the Minister of Education, at once instituted a policy of academic repression in all German universities and very soon afterwards Bauer's license to teach was revoked. This was a severe blow to Marx. An academic career at Bonn or elsewhere was now out of the question. What could he do?

Marx now turned to political journalism for his livelihood. *The Rhenische Zeitung,* the most radical of the bourgeois newspapers, became the medium for the expression of his discontent and protestations against the existing regime. In 1842 he was made editor in chief having Bauer, Koppin, Max Stirner and George Herwegh as contributors. He addressed himself to a propoganda for the freedom of the press. This constant criticism of the established censorship provoked the government to suppress the *Rhenische Zeitung* in March, 1843. In the summer of 1843 he married Jenny Von Westphalen and after a brief honeymoon the young couple went to Paris. They were warmly welcomed by his earlier friend Arnold Ruge, editor of the *Deutsche Jahrbücher,* Heinrich Heine the poet, Michael Bakunin the philosophical anarchist, and Pierre Proudhon, the anarchist philosopher, and Cabet the famous Utopist, were fellows in the social circle. Proudhon's severely critical attitude toward the Utopian Socialism of Fourier and Saint Simon helped Marx to a clear definition of his own position. Saint Simonian teaching had, however, a tremendous influence upon Marx though he found its religious mysticism nauseating. Fourier also had a sympathetic influence on the young radical. Marx was moving towards that conception of the French Revolution which made it a conflict of two economic classes rather than a mere political struggle between nobility and bourgeoisie. About this time Marx wrote for the *Deutsche-Französiche Jahrbücher* a criticism of Hegel's *Philosophy of Law.* In it he clearly formulates his materialistic conception, or rather his economic interpretation, of history. It was in September 1844 that Marx met for the first time the man whose name and deeds are inseparably interwoven with his own—Friedrich Engels. Born and educated in Germany he had been sent to England to take charge of a factory owned by his father's firm. He became immediately interested

in the Chartist movement and became a friend of the aged Robert Owen. He made a careful study of the industrial conditions in England and on his return to Germany he published in 1845 his book *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844.* The book stands to this day a classic example of sociological analysis and description. Engels and Marx were kindred spirits. They both had outgrown the attitude of the mere "dogmatism" of the socialistic virtues and were bent on political action. But their intense friendship went deeper than their economic convictions. There was a personal affinity due to psychical and temperamental contrasts. Marx was stout, Engels tall and thin; Marx was so dark that he was called "The Negro" by his friends; Engels was a pronounced blonde. Engels was cool and balanced in temperament, Marx was fiery and impulsive. They possessed complementary tastes, gifts and habits. Their friendship was truly romantic. Together they made a well rounded whole. The magazine venture proved a failure and there appeared in Paris a new journal the *Vorwärts* to meet the needs of German liberal thinkers resident in France. Marx became editor of the newspaper. The Prussian government grew restive under its attacks and requested Guizot to suppress *Vorwärts.* Marx was expelled from France and journeyed with his young wife and child to Brussels. The young couple found themselves painfully embarrassed for lack of money. Engels learning of their plight sent them a substantial remittance which kept the wolf from the door for a short time.

Engels was then at Elberfeld rejoicing in the communistic movement among the workingmen. In the summer of 1845 Engels, accompanied by Marx, returned to England. Here Marx made his first acquaintance with the writings of the English Radicals of the Ricardian School which exercised such a profound influence upon his thought and work. Marx read the brief outline of Engels' own criticism of political economy and gorged himself in the libraries of Manchester and elsewhere. They returned to Brussels in 1845 and wrote in collaboration their critique of the Hegelian philosophy. But more to the point they established connections with the radical Democrats of the city and Marx became the vice-president of the Democratic Society. They organized a German Workingmen's Club—a sort of labor union and secured control of the *Deutsche Brusseler*

Zeitung. They now sought to reach the working classes themselves, the proletariat of Europe in general and of Germany in particular. Marx devoted much time to economic studies, lectured occasionally, taught classes of workingmen the elements of political economy. He was a born teacher. Not only was he wonderfully patient and kind, contrary to the accepted view, but he possessed to a degree that was quite remarkable the ability to make the most abstract and abstruse matters clear and interesting to the ordinary untrained mind. His patience, however, was limited only to the industrious student. About this time appeared Proudhon's *La Philosophie de la Misere.* Though Marx and Proudhon had been friends the former did not hesitate to attack it in a pamphlet with the counter-title *La Misere de la Philosophie* which forever shattered the friendship of the two men. His reply is noteworthy as giving us a full statement of his materialistic conception of history. History must be interpreted in the light of economic development—this is his thesis and he brought the result of all his English reading to the task of exposing the fallacy of the "eternal laws" of Proudhon. Marx was opposed to Utopian colonizations in foreign lands and the *secret* insurrectionary movements for the overthrow of political masters. He would carry his fight for the working forces of the world into the open and establish the reign of right and justice on his native soil. An international alliance had been broached. The first meeting of its leaders took place in 1847 in the rooms of the Arbiter Buildings, in Great Treadwell street, London. Marx was not present preferring to remain in Brussels. Immediate and successful revolution Marx considered chimerical. He believed in the slower process of education and thorough preparation before the transformation was possible. The friends of Engels and Marx finally got control of the meeting and the Marxist principles were adopted. The League was known as the *Communist League,* The words Communist and "Socialist" had contrary meanings from that attached to them to-day. Then the plans of the Utopian schemers were called "Socialism," the working class movements "Communism." Marx opposed the over-sea colony in Texas proposed by Cabet then in Paris on the grounds of its impracticability. A second congress of the *League* was held in London in November in 1847. Marx attended this meeting accompanied by Engels.

The great leader prepared a carefully framed program which he was desirous the League should adopt as its principles and program of action. It was the first draft of the now famous *Manifesto.* This paper was read by Marx with great passion of voice and gesture and made a profound impression and was received with enthusiasm. Marx, with Engels as lieutenant, now became the leaders of the movement—the one thirty and Engels twenty-eight years of age. They made their headquarters once more at Brussels. On the day the revolution broke out in Paris, the birth cry of modern Socialism was heralded in the printed *Manifesto* written by Marx—"Workingmen of all Countries Unite."

And now we must summarize the main declarations of the *Manifesto* if we are to understand latter-day Socialism, for the *Communist Manifesto* is the Declaration of Independence of the working classes of Europe. Only a few of its leading tenets can be presented here.

The modern Bourgeois Society that has sprouted from the ruins of the feudal society has not done away with class antagonism. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoise and Proletariat." He was just to the good accomplished by the Bourgeoise regime. "The bourgeoise, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together." But, he goes on to say, "Modern bourgeoise society with its relations of production, of exchange, and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the forces of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgoise and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put on its trial, each time more and more threateningly, the entire existence of bourgeois society." The *Manifesto* then pictures the rise of the proletarian class. The "Iron law of wages" is no doubt overworked in his account of the rise of the employing and employed

classes but his main contention of the dependence and subserviency of the employed to the capitalistic group is clearly outlined. Capitalism depends upon wage-labor, and wage-labor, in turn depends upon competition among the laborers. The grouping of men in labor unions accomplishes much, but to Marx the real value of the collective harmony is the spirit of solidarity bred in the workers. This prepares them to act as a political force and as a great political party. The revolution must be accomplished by the proletariat. But Marx knew that no social movement could ever be confined absolutely to a single class. The movement would carry with it and needed sections of the bourgeoise and some of the noble-minded leaders of the older regime. The *Manifesto* reads:

"In the conditions of the proletariat, those of the old society at large are already virtually swamped. The proletariat is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labor, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests." In the second section of the *Manifesto* we read "All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historic change, consequent upon the change in historical conditions.... The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is, based on class antagonisms, or the exploitation of the many by the few ..... In this sense the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." The *Manifesto* disclaims the intention of taking from the laborer the product of his own toil. "There is no need to abolish that," says the *Manifesto,* "the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it and is still destroying it daily." "Does wage-labor create any property for the laborer? Not a bit. It creates capital, i. e., that kind of property which exploits wage-labor, and which cannot increase except on condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labor for

fresh exploitation." Marx then goes into a discussion of the nature of capital and wage labor. Concerning the family the *Manifesto* declares "The bourgeois clap-trap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parent and child becomes all the more disgusting, by the action of modern industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor. Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and this at most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women." The matter of nationalism and patriotism is then taken up. The *Manifesto* says, "The workingmen have no country.....Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class in the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is so far itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word..... The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and generally, from an ideological standpoint are not deserving of serious examination..... What else does the history of ideas prove, than that intellectual production changes its character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have been the ideas of its ruling class. The *Manifesto* closes with this proposed program.

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with the State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the whole county.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production."

Marx starts in with Locke's idea that the basis of property is labor, and works out a theory that in the evolution of society, the employing class has come to appropriate the surplus earnings of labor. This with his consideration of society as an evolution are the two most important and influential ideas of *Das Kapital issued in 1867.* The *Manifesto* which we have considered was much more radical than the later exposition of his ideas, but he believes in the inevitable assumption by the laboring class of the means of production and distribution. This is not the place to enter into a critique of Socialism. Suffice it to say that Marx lived to see the error of some of his prognostications especially the sudden rise of revolutionary conflict due to the rapid development of the two classes, employing and employed. His work was born in a revolutionary period and this storm and stress period of German and French history gave color to his prophecy. He was mistaken in his diagnosis of his age but his program for reorganization of the industrial and political state is as vital as ever.

At present we must address ourselves to his life rather than his teachings. The overthrow of the French monarch, Louis Philippe, in 1847, and the rise of a provisional government, a republic to be ratified by popular vote was the occasion for the violent agitation and demands of the working class. The "Crowing of the Gallican Cock" was heard throughout Europe. Marx was not deceived by the revolution for he saw that it was bourgeois rather than proletarian in its character. George Herwegh conceived the idea of carrying the revolution into Germany with a body of his excited fellow countrymen. Marx discouraged any such foolhardy escapade. What could such a legion do against the Prussian army? The Chartist movement in England blazed forth once more ending in the pathetic fiasco of the 10th of April. In Vienna the people were in revolt against their government. Metternich was deserted for his misrepresentation

of the Paris revolution. In Cologne a former artillery officer, August von Willich, led a mob into the council chamber and demanded that the municipality as a whole petition the King for freedom, for constitutional government. In Berlin there had been an outbreak. All night a battle raged. Marx and Engels remained in Paris. They welcomed the revolution, not because they entertained the false hope that the mere destruction of reactionary governments would bring about any great social change, but because they realized that it was a necessary, preliminary condition for the development of a class-conscious proletariat movement such as they were seeking to develop. Marx was present at the Democratic congress held in Cologne in 1848, but his contemptuous mannner toward all those who differed from him lost instead of gained friends for his ultimate political program. So he appeared at least to the youthful Carl Schurz, though others considered him patient in the propagation of his ideas. Marx was expelled from Prussia and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* suppressed. Marx and his family had suffered many hardships during their fight against society and despotism. As soon as he was expelled from Prussia, Marx hastened to Paris. He reached Paris in May and as soon as his family was settled he devoted himself to the discharge of the commission with which the Rheinish Democrats had entrusted him. The anticipated uprising was a failure and soon a sergeant stood at Marx's door announcing his expulsion from Paris. With his family he turned his face toward London—"the Mother of Exiles." It should be noted here that Mrs. Marx was not left alone with her children upon such journeys or occasions. With her always went her faithful companion, Helene Demuth, the noble "Lenchen" of whom we shall hear more. She had grown up in the household of the Westphalens as one of the family, treating little Jenny and her playmate, Karl as her own sister and brother. Marx arrived in London toward the end of June 1849, and took furnished lodgings somewhere in the Camberwell district of the city. Into this state of poverty came in July the fourth child, a boy, named Henry, doomed to early death like so many children of the poor. A German radical had a hard time to find work in the English metropolis. Marx wrote a few articles for the Chartist journals but probably received not a penny in payment. Marx as we know had no sympathy with "secret"

and "shady" political propagandas and his position, now, among the hot-heads of the revolutionary movement was a peculiar one. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was revived through its old friends and was edited by Marx in London. The domestic situation of the Marx family was more than distressing. In a letter written by the refined and gentle wife of the proud and courageous propagandist of Socialism —a letter laying bare to an intimate friend their unbearable plight she says, "I will describe to you only one single day of this life, and you will see that very few fugitives have gone through similar experiences. The keeping of a wet nurse for my baby was out of question, so I resolved to nurse the child myself, in spite of constant terrible pains in the breast and back. But the poor little angel drank so much silent worry from me that he was sickly from the first day of his life, lying in pain day and night..... In those pains he drew so hard that my breast got sore and broke open; often the blood streamed into his little wavering mouth. So I was sitting one day, when unexpectedly our landlady stepped in, to whom we had paid 250 thalers during the winter, and with whom we had a contract to pay, after that, the rent to the owner of the house. She denied the contract and demanded five pounds, the sum we owed for rent, and because we were unable to pay at once two constables stepped in and attached my small belongings, beds, linen, clothes, all, even the cradle of my poor baby and the toys of the two girls, who stood by crying bitterly..... The next day we had to get out of the house. It was cold, rainy and gloomy. My husband was out hunting for rooms. In the end a friend helped us..... We were able, after the selling of everything we possessed, to pay every cent. I moved with our little ones into our present two small rooms in the German Hotel, 1, Leicester street, Leicester Square, where we have found a week's shelter and board for five and one-half pounds..... Do not believe these petty sufferings have bent us..... But what strikes me the hardest and causes my heart to bleed is that my husband has to endure so many petty annoyances while he could be helped with so very little and that he, who is willing and with pleasure, has helped so many, stands here so helpless and nobody to help him." Such was the bitter and tragic situation of Marx during the winter of 1850.

Marx had a peculiar love for little children and the hunger

and suffering of his own must have haunted and harried his soul. He became the London correspondent of the *New York Tribune.* He received five dollars a week for his letters. This was for years his only regular and certain income. The fourth child, Henry, died in 1852. In spite of misery and privations Marx refused to receive a single penny in payment for his lectures to workingmen. He did not wish to be charged with "exploiting the movement."

Marx did not believe that labor unions could or should remain neutral upon political questions. He knew that in a constantly increasing degree the workers must depend for betterment of their conditions upon legislation. To such matters as factory legislation, accident insurance, employer's liability, old age pensions, the legal eight-hour day, child labor laws, the protection of trades union funds, security of the right of combination, freedom from crippling restraints of judicial usurpation, the trades unions can not be indifferent. He approved heartily, however, of the resolution adopted by the trades union leaders at Gotha in 1875, immediately after the union of the Socialist factions, declaring that politics should be kept out of the trades unions, but that individual members were advised to join the Social-Democratic Party, by which name the united Socialist party was known. This was not a consistent position as Bebel, in 1900, declared. He was the inspiring spirit of The International Workingmen's Association—the most ambitious and fruitful movement for arousing the proletariat to a sense of solidity. His practical labors in connection with organizing and directing this International would alone entitle Marx to distinction. Into the short and tumultuous history of this workingmen's association we can not enter. It collapsed at the time of the Franco-Prussian War.

This paper is biographical in its nature, not a critique of Socialism, but a word concerning the basal principles of *Das Kapital* may be of interest. For ten years he had been preparing for the writing of this classic of Socialism. He read hard and continuously in the British Museum. Hundreds of treatise and Parliamentary reports were worked over. His fine sense of thoroughness and mathematical form would not permit him to offer anything less than a scientific presentation of the industrial and

social conditions as he saw them in England and to some extent in Germany and in France.

John Rae has said in his *Contemporary Socialism*, "Capital, then, as Marx understands it, may be said to be independent wealth employed for its own increase," and in "societies in which the capitalistic method of production prevails" all wealth bears distinctively this character. In more primitive days, wealth was a store of the means of life produced and preserved for the supply of the producers future wants, but now it "appears as a huge collection of wares," made for other people's wants, made for sale in the market, made for its own increase. What Marx wants to discover is how all this independent wealth has come to accumulate in hands that do not produce it, and in particular from whence comes the increase expected from its use, because it is this increase that enables it to accumulate. What he endeavors to show is that this increase of value can not take place anywhere except in the process of production, that in that process it can not come from dead materials, but only from the living creative power of labor that works upon them, and that it is accordingly virtually stolen from the laborers who made it by the superior economic force of the owners of the dead materials, without which indeed it could not be made, but whose service is entitled to a much more limited reward." Marx bases his argument on two principles which he borrowed from current economic writers, without, however, observing the limitations under which those writers taught them, and introducing besides important modifications of his own. The one principle is that value comes from labor, or that the natural value of commodities is determined by the cost of production. The second is only a special application of the first, that the natural wages of labor are determined by the cost of its production, and that the cost of the production of labor is the cost of the laborer's subsistence. The fault he finds with the present system is accordingly this, that while labor creates all value it is paid only its stated living, no matter how much value it creates; and he then goes over the phenomena of modern industrial life to show how each arrangement is invented so as to exact more and more value out of the laborer by prolonging his hours of work or enhancing its speed without giving him any

advantage whatever from the increase of value so obtained. This is not the place to attempt to disprove his theory of value, his "Iron law of wages," or the effects of machinery, and the growth of fixed capital on the working classes. We must return to our story.

Marx did not live to complete his second volume of *Das Kapital,* He became an opponent of Bakunin's program of anti-religionism in the Socialist congress in 1869. That Marx was an atheist is undeniable; but he regarded the "professional atheist," with ill-concealed contempt, and nothing could be farther from the truth than to represent him as a rabid anti-religionist. Indeed, there was the surge of a great spiritual passion within this strange man. So great was his love for the great *Divine Comedy* of Dante that he could repeat canto after canto, almost the whole of it, in fact. He came nearer to being a disciple of our Whitman in religon than to any other prophet of cosmic life. His health was now failing. By the end of 1873 he was a very sick man. The collapse of the "International" was a great blow to him, but the rising vote of the *Socialists* in 1871 had raised his hopes for the final success of the supreme purpose of his life. But his strength was rapidly declining. He made a brave fight for life. In 1880 his precious and devoted wife developed cancer from which she could not be relieved. Marx was frantic with grief. He was stricken with pleurisy and confined to bed for many weeks. On the 14th of March, 1883, the crisis came. His life-long friend Engels was summoned. He was told by the faithful companion of his wife, good Helen Demuth, and Eleanor, his daughter, that Marx would be found seated in his arm-chair half asleep. Engels went to the study and found his old friend not half asleep but fully asleep, with a smile upon his lips. Karl Marx was dead.

Three days later they laid his body to rest in the Highgate Cemetery where that of his wife had been laid fifteen months previously. Only a small handfull of mourners gathered around the grave that Saturday afternoon to hear Engels; his voice broken by sobs, pay the last tender and affectionate tribute to the memory of his friend.

So passed this mighty human force whose work in book and deed still gives the greatest impetus to the Socialistic propa-

ganda of to-day. Whatever may be the fate of his theories his martyrdom in the cause of what he believed to be the truth and the way of truth's realization will place him and keep him among the great spirits of humanity.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE VIII.

RITUALISM.

BY GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D.

"Ritualism" is a comparatively new word in the English dictionary. "Ritualist" is found in Johnson's and other dictionaries of the seventeenth century, but "ritualism" as a dictionary word, is contemporary with ourselves. It owes its origin to that remarkable movement which began in Oxford in 1833.. The early adherents of the movement were called Tractarians, from the 90 Tracts which they published in defense and furtherance of their ideas; also Puseyites, after one of its most distinguished leaders. At present the name Anglicans or Anglo-Catholics is preferred by them.

The word ritualism is derived from *Rituale,* the name of that book in the Roman Catholic Church which gives detailed direction as to the manner in which acts of religious usage should be performed *rite,* that is in a proper manner.

On the subject of rites and ceremonies both the sister Churches of the Protestant Reformation took the ground that they belonged to the *adiaphora,* but while the Reformed Churches took a radical course, removing and rejecting everything that they did not find authorized or commanded in the Scripture, making a *tabula rasa,* and returning to extreme simplicity, the Lutherans took a conservative position, retaining in the Church worship everything that was not contrary to the Word of God. A superficial observer, unacquainted with the significance of the liturgy, might in Lutheran worship therefore scarcely notice any distinction from that which is observed in Roman Catholic Churches.

The English Church in the days of the Protestant Reformation was of the Lutheran type. Its leaders, Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, were in close touch with Luther and Melanchthon. The Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth was a Lutheran Liturgy. The Thirty-nine Articles were modeled after the Augsburg Confession, and many of them are almost verbal reproductions of the Augustana, with such modifications as

would be satisfactory to the Reformed also. Martin Buzer came over from Strassburg and spent a long time in Oxford, aiding the English in their liturgical and doctrinal work.

Edward the Sixth's Prayer Book of 1549 has all the ear marks of having been constructed under the influence of the Lutheran Liturgy of Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, 1543. I mention this for the benefit of the Episcopalian brethren who firmly believe that their book was made in the year 1, and who say to me: "Why your service is very much like ours."

In the seventeenth century an effort was made to conciliate the Presbyterians, and the present Book of Common Prayer is the result of that effort to conciliate and to compromise. This was done in the Savoy Conference which was held in 1661. After the Presbyterians had succeeded in carrying many of their points, and the Prayer Book had been trimmed and altered to meet their views, they withdrew and said they did not care much for a Prayer Book anyway. Thereupon they left the Episcopalians to get along with a book from which many Lutheran and historical elements had been eliminated.

The Book of Common Prayer, with all its vaunted excellencies, has also its defects. Its chief merits are its good English, and a certain brusque adaptation of some of its parts to the changed atmosphere of modern times. This latter quality it probably got from the Presbyterians. Its chief defect is a jumbling together into one of three distinct services, viz.: Morning Prayer, a Preparatory Service, and the regular Morning Service. This produces the conglomeration and iteration which have made the Episcopal form of worship a fair object of criticism.

The ritualistic movement has a special interest for us because it is almost contemporaneous with at least the older members of our ministry. Although from the outside, we have witnessed its conflicts and its successes. The career of its leaders is familiar to us. Its watchwords and many of its phrases are stereotyped in the literature of our times and its aims have called forth our sympathy or our resentment as the case may be. The great men of the Anglican communion whom we have known or who have just preceded us have lived their lives with a definite relation to this movement. And we have seen what is practically the triumph of the movement not only in England but also in

America. Whether for good or ill, it has been a victorious movement among the adherents of Episcopal polity. And it has deeply affected almost all other churches. The existence of a well-defined policy, consistent and uncompromising, could not but have a controlling influence upon multitudes of spineless Protestants whose religion was purely a matter of subjectivity, with no clear conception of the doctrine of the Church and with no dogmatic convictions to anchor them to the truth once delivered to the saints.

To understand the scope of the movement, we must take a glance at the times in which it originated. Religion was at a low ebb in England in the early part of the eighteenth century. The Wesleyan movement had failed to influence the Church of England, and its adherents had been cast out of the synagogue. Infidelity and worldliness were the characteristics of the times. The Evangelical revival which occurred at the beginning of the century had a deep and widespread influence. Tract and Bible societies, missionary work and the preaching of the Gospel produced results of the greatest magnitude. The regeneration of the Church of England was undoubtedly due to this Evangelical movement. But, as it was essentially a practical movement, dealing only with personal Christianity and with no interest in the Church or dogma, looking upon these things as the letter that killeth, it failed to bring about any permanent results in the Christian communion. Then came the great political changes. The abolition of the Test Act, the admission of non-conformists and Catholics to political privileges, the extinction of half the Irish bishoprics, and similar catastrophies made the adherents of the English State Church feel that it was time to set their house in order.

It was under these conditions that a number of young Oxford men came together in Hadleigh in July, 1833, to consider the needs of the times. Their names were Keble, Pusey, Newman, Froude and Perceval. They were filled with religious zeal and with an intense desire to find a remedy for the evils of the times in which they lived. As Oxford men their thoughts naturally recurred to Archbishop Laud, whose life had been so closely associated with their university, and it seemed to them that the salvation of the English Church depended upon a restoration of his system. Laud, you remember, was the ecclesiastical mentor

of the Stuarts and the persecutor of the Puritans. Born in the latter part of the sixteenth century, he early attained ecclesiastical promotion, endeavored by all means to restore the ceremonies and discipline of the Pre-Reformation period, and after a strenuous career of politico-religious strife was decapitated in 1645 at the age of 72. On the scaffold he preached a sermon from Hebrews 12:2, "Looking unto Jesus," and offered a prayer of saintly unction, an expression of penitence and faith such as any Christian might desire to make in the hour of his departure. He was the best hated and best loved man of his time. Many things that he did we must criticise, for instance the cutting off of Prynne's ears, but his death was an event of incomparable dignity.

It seems a pity that such men have to be killed. But in those hard-headed days it was difficult to convince men by ordinary argument, and the only really effective way of preventing erroneous cerebration was the amputation of that part of the body which contained the diseased organ.

I have spoken so much of Laud because the Ritualists themselves looked upon him as their leader, and advocated a return to the principles for which he contended. Briefly stated, this was Laud's position: Want of uniformity produces the greatest confusion. Worship in the spirit is the chief thing, but external unity is an important testimony to the world. The Scriptures, as the Primitive Church and an Ecumenical Council explain them, are the only rule in matters of faith. Ceremonies have a reflex influence on the soul. In place of the absolute decree he proclaimed the doctrine of grace. Sacraments meant more than the Puritans hold concerning them. Baptism confers regeneration. The Lord's Supper is not merely a *sacramentum* but is also a *sacrificium*. Here we find the outlines of the chief positions of the Ritualists as they were subsequently developed: the appeal to the Primitive Church, the importance of Catholicity, the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper and the importance of ceremonies.

And on most of these questions it is easy to see how a sensible and pious Christian man was almost compelled to take the position of Laud. The Puritans had snapped the thread of history. He attempted to restore it. The Puritans plunged into the confusion of sectarianism and individualism, he em-

phasized Catholicity, the Puritans emphasized the decree, he emphasized grace; the Puritans were iconoclasts who destroyed the stately temples and looked upon their fair decorations as the garments of the great whore, he endeavored to restore all those beautiful things which the sanctified art of the ages had laid down at the feet of Him whom they worshipped; the Puritans shoved the Lord's table all around the Church and sat upon it, he placed it in the Eastern choir, put a screen before it and tried to impress some ideas of reverence and decency upon the people. Of course he went too far. But the Puritans have their faults too, and it is no wonder that the pendulum swung again in the other direction. Much as we must condemn Laud from our standpoint, his position is easily understood and it was almost inevitable.

During the Restoration the Laud movement maintained itself for a little while, but with the departure of the Stuarts its influence subsided, until it suddenly came to life again in the Oxford movement of 1833.

The soul of this movement was Richard Hurrell Froude. He was a fellow and tutor in Oriel College, born in 1803 and died in 1836 at the age of 33. Both then and now the ideas which he expressed in essays, letters and sermons were the controlling factors in the movement.

Disappointed in his study of the English Reformation he turned at first to the Laud school. Laud had been a Fellow at Oxford and a benefactor of the university. Through Laud Froude was led back to the Primitive Church. The canon of Vincentius of Lirinum, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ad omnibus creditum est,* he recognizes as the principle of Catholicity, the criterion of the true Church. The Reformation, he complains, had taken away the *jus divinum* of the Church, had made the sermon instead of the sacrament the means of grace, had made justification by faith an integral part of the doctrine of salvation; and of the Church system, discipline, &c., only a few crumbs remained that had fallen from the Apostles' tables. "I hate the Reformers and the Reformation," he declared, "and I am convinced that the rationalistic spirit which proceeded from them is none other than the false prophet of the Apocalypse." He pours out the vials of his wrath on the phraseology of the Protestants. He will have nothing to do with those who irreverent-

ly speak of the Holy Eucharist as the Lord's Supper, of priests as ministers, of the altar as the Lord's Table. He believed that a revival of monasticism would solve the problem of the spiritual need in the great cities. He had an aesthetic temperament, and he desired that architecture, furniture and music might be governed by the best models of the ancient Church

Three principles are maintained by the Ritualists:

1. The authority of the primitive church. 2. Desirability of union with the Episcopal churches of the continent (Romish, Greek, &c.) 3. The retention of the Pre-Reformation ceremonial of worship.

My subject does not require me to deal with their positions in the matter of doctrine or church polity. Their views on ceremonial were not emphasized during the first 25 years of their history. It was not till 1859 that this became a burning question in England. The six points of ceremony were the Eastward position, eucharistic vestments, lights, incense, the mixed chalice, unleavened bread (the wafer).

The rubrics of the Anglican ritual prescribe in the most exact and definite manner the movements of the priest. The wayfaring man need not err. With much of this there will be little sympathy among the readers of this article, and I already anticipate the ridicule which you will heap upon the ecclesiastical millinery and the religious attitudinarianism of these hopelessly impractical repristinationists.

But there is another side to the story. The ritualism of the ritualists should be set over against the ritualism of the anti-ritualists. It is perhaps only a matter of taste, but a reverent folding of the hands in prayer certainly seems more decent than the impudent crossing of the arms across the back, or addressing the Almighty with hands in the pockets.

To sign yourself with the cross, and to bow the head at the mention of the Redeemer's name may be Catholic, but it is more likely to promote a reverent use of the hour of service than the giggling and gossiping which are so common in many of our religious assemblies. The ritualistic priest is somewhat stiff in his movements; still I prefer his ways to those of the Protestant preacher who lounges back in his sofa on the pulpit platform, engaged in easy conversation with one of his colleagues, or crossing his legs, vulgarly stares at the audience, possibly even count-

ing his congregation when he ought to be saying his prayers.

Chasuble, cope and stole are garments which I do not require, but a minister arrayed in some such uniform, with a style that never changes, looks better to me than one who adopts the garb of a hotel waiter or a dry goods clerk. The jingling airs and the hippity-hop of much of our congregational singing cannot compare with the stately measures of church song. The paraments of the Lord's house will forever protest against the uncouth decorations of many a church interior, and the dignity and reverent lines of church architecture against the florid and profane structures which sometimes bear the name of churches.

Smile as we may at some of the idiosyncracies of our ritualistic brethren, they have got hold of ideas that it may be well for us to consider When the German barbarians had conquered Rome, they stopped with amazement at the sight of Christian priests ministering in the churches, and were themselves conquered in turn. People instinctively feel that there ought to be some correspondence between the outward form and the ideas which it represents. No wonder that some of our fashionable congregations of non-conformist origin, with a dim and groping feeling of their defects, introduce into their worship all sorts of ritual borrowed from the Episcopalians, but not understanding their history or significance, sometimes produce the effect of an unclassified collection of liturgical antiquities.

I hold no brief for the defense of the Ritualists, but I think it well to remind ourselves that there always was some justification for their position, in Cyprian's day, in Laud's day, in Pusey's day and in our day, and that instead of simply scorning them, we should ascertain the secret of the strength of such a movement, which must inevitably prevail if it is confronted only by the unhistorical anarchy of non-conforming individualism.

Neither ritualism nor its antagonists will have the last word to say on the subject of the forms of worship, but evangelical freedom under the guidance of historical principles. Neither spiritualistic fear of forms nor spiritless subjection to forms has its place in the worship of the evangelical church. We are the immediate heirs of the Rationalistic period which in iconoclastic folly destroyed many beautiful forms, and then like the child with the broken vase wondered that the contents had gone. In our study of the liturgy and admiration of its beauty, the

danger is that we do not understand the spirit and thus fall into mere formalism.

There is such a thing as church style which is born of the Scriptures, not merely for the church building but also for the congregational service. Its foundation principle is "edification" (1 Cor. 14, 12). Its rule is "Let all things be done decently and in order." (Verse 40).

This church style, without being a ritual law, as in Rome, becomes the law of action whenever it is desired to give suitable expression to the Word of God in acts of worship and particularly in the expression of the Visible Word, the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

In the Church of the Augsburg Confession there are two fundamental principles, the authority of the Word of God and justification byfaith. Hence preaching, the preaching of the Word of God, occupies a central position in the Lutheran service. In the Ritualistic movement we may also find two ultimate principles, the authority of the Church, and salvation by sacraments. Hence preaching with them occupies only a subordinate place. On these two positions of the Ritualists (the authority of the Church and Salvation by works) we Lutherans take issue with them absolutely.

First as to the Church. There are two definitions of the Church. The first of these dominated Christendom for 1300 years from the Crypian to Bellarmine. It is that the Church is an institution with which men become connected, not by any *interna virtus* but solely through an external profession of faith and an external use of the sacraments. This is the Romish view and this is the view of Ritualism. The Church is edified, built up, kept alive, by the virtue that oozes from the hands of the clergyman. The other definition of the Church is that it is a communion, a congregation of saints, that is of those who are being sanctified, healed. This is the universal Protestant position.

Second as to the sacraments. We also, unlike the Reformed denominations, believe that the sacraments are means of grace in the strict and technical sense. But they derive their validity, not *opere operato,* or from any priestly function, but from the Word of God. And particularly do we take exception to their view of the Communion. It is a sacrament and not a sacrifice. It is a sacrament, that is a gift of God to us, and not a sacrifice,

that is, an offering which we make to God, as teach the Zwinglians, most ancient Protestant denominations, and the Ritualists, strange colleagues indeed in this case.

It is this sacrificial view of the Lord's Supper that lies at the base of all their ritualistic errors. From an aesthetic point of view, I agree with this mode of conducting worship. But from a closer examination of their books and ceremonies it may easily be seen that their service is more than mere symbolism, it is the worship of a God that has been made by the hand of a priest.

The early Church knew nothing of the sacrificial character of the Supper. But the rhetorical character of the Greek language lent itself to liturgical expressions which step by step led to a conception of the sacrament that was foreign to its original meaning. Through Cyprian and Gregory this conception became a fundamental position of the Roman system and through Laud and Froude and Pusey it has again obtained a foothold in the Protestant Church after Luther and the Reformation had repudiated it as an utter perversion of its original purpose and significance.

Doubtless in this fragmentary presentation of the subject I have not been able to conceal a degree of sympathy with the Ritualistic movement and admiration for that which it has accomplished. There are many things in it which are wonderfully attractive, and which, whatever we may say or think, will continue to exert a permanent influence on the lives of men. I love their historical sense, their reverence for tradition, their aesthetic tact, their decency in the method of conducting worship, and above all their religious zeal. The Holy Supper is more than a memorial feast, they recognize in it the presence of the Lord. All of these things bring them into close alliance with the Lutheran system. At our first meeting, when I come in contact with a High Church Angelican we seem like long lost brothers. But it does not take long to discover that there is no relation-
But it does not take long to discover that there is no relation-
ship. Froude says he hates the Reformation. Ritualism, in its essential and central position, I hate it with a perfect hatred. For all that we seem to have in common, their fundamental positions separate them *toto coelo* from the Church of the Conservative Reformation.

New York City.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The Methodist Review (Sept.-Oct.) contains an article on "Luther's Lectures on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans," by Professor G. C. Cell, D.D., of the Boston University, reciting the facts of the recent discovery of the original manuscript in the Royal Library of Berlin, where, strange to say, it has reposed undisturbed in a show case. "The original document makes 152 pages of printed text, written notes and comment. This material fills 588 pages 8 vo. Luther wrote a very fine hand, neat and accurate, nowhere slovenly. The subject matter of the Lectures is divided into two main parts, the Glossae and the Scholia. The former consists of suggestive words, pointed phrases, concise sentences written between the lines and along the margin, serving as memoranda for the lectures. The state of the writing indicates that the interlinear notes were written first and the marginal reflections added afterward. The subject matter of the Scholia comes out of a much more thorough mental process. Here we have a final weaving together into a living connected whole of a large mass of fragmentary productions." To Professor Johann Ficker belongs the credit for bringing to light again this most valuable commentary of Luther. Dr. Cell shows a proper appreciation not only of this notable work but also of its renowned author.

"Whitefield's Divine Gift" is discussed in the same number of the *Methodist Review* by Professor Tipple of Drew Seminary. The secret of his marvelous power over an audience surely did not lie in the mere letter of his sermons as we have them in print—eighty of them. Benjamin Franklin felt that Whitefield had done himself great injustice by permitting their publication. "For the most part they are flat, stale and unprofitable. The common criticism of them is that they contain no powerful movement of thought and the criticism is a just one." Of course, Whitefield preached without manuscript and his best passages were often the inspiration of the moment. At all

events he made the most profound impression upon all classes of people, and must have been possessed of real and great power. Some critics have found the secret of his influence over his hearers in his deep piety. He was a consecrated man and prayed without ceasing, but this was only an element in his power, for many other preachers have been equally devoted without becoming noted. The author asks, "Would it not be more nearly correct to say that he had a gift from God, namely, the divine spirit called eloquence and that the effectiveness of this gift was heightened by his piety? It was Whitefield's divine gift—and why not agree that the mystery of eloquence comes as near as anything we know to a preternatural endowment; that what men call unction is indefinable and inexplicable; that genius is not of the market place, or of the mountain, but of God? It was this God-bestowed gift which secured for Whitefield favor with all classes of people." "Whitefield regarded his oratory as a gift of his Creator, and this is the opinion of his biographers." He had a wonderful voice, strong, musical, "carrying" and under perfect control. He strongly urged the importance of the study and practice of elocution in preparation for the ministry. He possessed an unusual gift of emotion. There was deep pathos in his voice. His "weeping silences" few could withstand. He was overwhelmed with a passion for souls. "He preached more successfully than any man of his generation, and the secret of his unrivaled power was in the faithful cultivation and use of his matchless endowment and other divine gifts, the sum total of which we designate by the elusive term, personality."

The great convention of the Baptists in Philadelphia during the past summer is the inspiration of the "Baptist World Alliance Number of *The Review and Expositor.*" "The Attitude of Baptists to Catholicism," "Baptists in the Modern World," "The Attitude of Baptists to the non-Christian World," "History of Baptist Organization," "The Struggle for Religious Liberty," "Some Types and Tendencies Among American Baptists," "The Origin and Principles of the Anabaptists," and "The Moral Significance of Baptism," are the themes discussed.

The last article makes "Baptism * * the symbol of the actual death and resurrection of Christ, and at the same time the symbol of the (as it were) actual death and resurrection of the be-

liever. That is to say: his relation to the world, on the one hand, as expressed in his baptism, is the relation of one dead; and on the other hand, his relation to Christ is the relation of one risen from the dead." A true Baptist denies that baptism is a sacrament. It has no "efficacy as a means for the transmission of grace." It is merely "a beautiful and expressive symbol of certain basal facts in the redemptive mission of the Lord Jesus Christ, together with certain correlated and dependent ideas. * * The sole value of the rite consists in this." Other writers in the *Review* agree with this exceedingly low view of baptism. It seems passing strange that with this view our Baptist brethren should insist so strenuously upon the rite, and that too upon a particularistic method of its administration. If it be a mere symbol, its omission can not be very serious. In actual practice, however, the Baptists put quite a different emphasis upon its necessity.. Indeed, as far as we can see, baptism by immersion is the one bond that binds these brethren together —not very compactly, it is true. Dr. Landrum's discussion of "Some Types," &c., is very interesting. He finds the following types: the Liberalistic, the Literalistic, the Ritualistic, the Pessimistic, and the Pietistic. The modification of these types and the unification of the denomination is gradually going on and will probably find their most potent factor in the reflex influence of Foreign Missions.

"Rational Mysticism and New Testament Christianity" is the attractive theme discussed by Henry W. Clark of Harpenden, England, in the July *Harvard Theological Review*. Mysticism rightly declares that religion is ultimately and essentially a losing of self in God. Cold reason has sometimes betrayed mysticism into accepting a false antithesis, that because it may go beyond reason that therefore it is hostile to it. As a fact there is no conflict between the two. It is true that mysticism is not, except incidentally, a matter of knowledge. It is something else and something more. It means "the acceptance of God by man as the actual, energizing, dynamic source of all that man is—man setting himself in such a Godward relation that henceforth he is, in regard to all that proceeds from him in the way of activity, emotion, and the rest, mediate instead of immediate, a channel instead of a spring. Mysticism aims at the substitu-

tion of God's initiative for man's within man's own personality —except, of course, that the initiative of surrender, the initiative in giving up initiative, must on man's part be ceaselessly maintained." With this revised apprehension of what mysticism in its essence really is, we may be led to see that there is nothing incompatible between it and reason.

"The Pastor and Teacher in New England," discussed by Vergil V. Phelps of Montana in the same *Review* is of great historic interest and suggestive. He shows that "in early New England a fully organized church had as officers a pastor, a teacher, and at least one ruling elder, and one deacon." The pastor was the administrative head, visitor and adviser, while the teacher was the educational and doctrinal leader, but he was not a schoolmaster. In the public service it was he who read and expounded the Bible, while the pastor would follow with practical applications and exhortations. They were practically equal in position, pay and honor. This "institution of pastor and teacher was the general practice of the New England Churches about 1640." It gradually declined and with the American Revolution it disappeared altogether. The origin of the institution the author finds in Theodore Beza, who drew his ideas from Erasmus, and the church fathers, Ambrose and Gregory Nazianzen. However, the idea that the Church as a local congregation, independent of all outside authority, demanded both pastor and teacher. This was the theory and practice of Luther, Zwingli and Calvin.

New England lost the teacher, but he became identified with the great public school movement. Yet the author deplores the consequent separation of education and religion.

Concerning this institution we would say that the Puritan idea was anomalous and died naturally. The author does not even allude to the parochial school. The parochial school teacher fills all the necessary requirements and we can only deplore that outside of the Catholic Church and some branches of our own Lutheran Church he does not exist.

A considerable part of the July *Princeton Theological Review* is taken up with articles on the English Bible, the tercentenary of the publication of whose Authorized Version occurred this year. "Of this 'Authorized Version' two things

must be said," remarks Dr. Erdman, "first, it was not a version, and second, it was never authorized. Instead of being a new version it was in reality a revision of the work of Tyndale; not more than four words in a hundred were altered. The phrase on the title page 'translated from the original languages' is not to be taken too literally. * * The work of Tyndale shaped all that was done.

The genesis of the English Bible is most interesting. A century before the birth of Luther, John Wicliff had given the English the Bible in their own tongue; but violent persecutions practically destroyed this precious work, so that 150 years later when Luther's translation appeared the English were without the Bible.

It is to William Tyndale (b. 1484) that the English owe the Bible out of which the Authorized Version grew. It seems strange that in the recent literature called forth by the tercentenary celebration no mention should be made of Tyndale's dependence upon Luther's work. Dr. Jacobs, in his "Lutheran Movement in England" (Chap. ii), has clearly demonstrated that Tyndale made free use of Luther's translation.

In *The Reformed Church Review* for July, Rev. E. B. Niver, rector of Christ Episcopal Church, Baltimore, writes of "The Episcopal Church and Unity," in which he sketches three epoch-making movements in his church toward unity, showing first the ideal of unity which the Episcopal Church has come to possess; and secondly, the part which he thinks that communion has in furthering it. The earliest of these movements goes back over fifty years and is associated with the name of Dr. Muhlenberg. The second is the utterance of the Chicago Convention of 1886, which led to the Lambeth Platform or Quadrilateral. The last is the action of the Cincinnati Convention of 1910, calling a Conference on Faith and Order planned on the lines of the recent great Edinburgh Missionary Conference. The first movement, headed by Muhlenberg, who presented a Memorial to the General Convention in New York in 1853, reached no practical end, and was forgotten amid the great issues of the Civil War.

The second movement crystalized into a statement of four supposed self-evident propositions necessary to the unity of the Church of Christ. The acceptance (a) of the Bible as the Re-

vealed Word, (b) of the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, (c) of the two Sacraments, (d) of "The Historic Episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God unto the unity of his Church." This platform was adopted two years later at the Lambeth Conference by the Bishops of practically the whole Episcopal Church throughout the world.

The present movement lays down no principles but pleads for a fraternal conference of all Christian denominations, many of whom have, indeed, already accepted the invitation to send representatives to consider the momentous question of Christian unity. While the call makes no mention of "the historic episcopate" its interpreter, in the article before us, alludes to it as the distinctive contribution which the Angelican Church must offer toward the unifying of Protestant Christianity. He says, "The most distinctive mark of the Angelican Church among the Churches of the Reformation is the Episcopate. In the Providence of God that Church is the steward, the trustee, of an historic ministry.* * It is a ministry reaching back in the past to the earliest Christian ages."

We can not doubt the sincerity of our Episcopal brethren, and heartily endorse the effort toward unity, but the insistance upon "the historic episcopate" as a fundamental principle will not bring the non-Episcopal Churches into a common fold.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL R. WENTZ, A.M. B.D.

The facts of Luther's life, his religious and theological development, continue to busy the historians on both sides of the Atlantic. American literature of the present year has been unusually well represented on this field by McGiffert's vivid and picturesque portrayal in the current issues of *The Century,* and by the stimulating volume of Preserved Smith just published. But a new biography of Luther has also recently appeared in Luther's own native tongue. It comes from the pen of a Catholic theologian. The first volume embracing nearly seven hundred large pages of fine print has already passed into the second edition. The work is planned for three volumes and when complete will be more comprehensive than any Protestant work on

Luther. The author of this pretentious book is the Jesuit theologian in Innsbruck, Hartmann Grisar. Now the learning of the Jesuists has long since commanded the respect even of the Protestants. But history has taught us to recognize in that order the most determined foe of Protestantism. And as such the Jesuists regard themselves. The published literature of the Jesuists and even the official documents of the Catholic Church openly proclaim the principle that Loyola was the special agent divinely raised up to withstand the ravages of Protestantism. What sort of Luther biography may we expect from a member of a society that is committed to implacable hatred of the heretics and that regards itself as the divinely ordained remedy for the wicked and adulterous generation of Martin Luther? And yet it will not suffice to consign Grisar to the limbus of dogmatic and prepossessed historians and therewith dismiss him from our presence. This work of his is very tactfully disposed. It is stripped of that artless naivete of hatred and that manifest prejudice which has characterized the previous works on Luther which have come from the Roman camp. Its promises are alluring. It is therefore the more dangerous. Moreover, Hartmann Grisar has for some years been recognized as a Catholic scholar without a Protestant superior in his comprehensive knowledge of Luther's writings and of all the literature on Luther both Catholic and Protestant. His biography of Luther therefore can not be ignored.

Grisar's work is not without a pretense of historical objectivity. The cool conservative style in which he writes and the serious scientific forms which he employs awaken at once a feeling of confidence in the reader. In the introduction he calmly discusses the question whether it is actually impossible for a Catholic historian to lay aside all subjective prepossessions and to depict Luther as he really is without offending the just feelings of the Protestants. This question he answers with a decided affirmative and then feigning the spirit of reconciliation he proceeds tactfully to his task. Herein he differs, and that purposely, from his predecessors among the Catholic biographers of Luther. They made no secret of their real feelings for the subject of their portrayals. The three most important Catholic biographers of Luther have been Jenssen, Evers, and Denifle. The portrayal of Janssen thirty years ago which

served the Catholics so conveniently during the Luther-Jubilee of 1883, has long since been recognized even by the Catholics themselves as utterly false in its perspective and even consciously perverse in its intent. Janssen's ingenious art of making excerpts from the sources and of disposing his material in such a way as to suggest false conclusions without actually drawing them, has been laid bare and has thoroughly discredited him. Even more unsatisfactory was the effort completed ten years later of George Evers, the convert from the Lutheran ministry. Evers' six volumes of popular-magazine pamphletry constitute a sustained outburst of hate. The ugly tone, the indecency of the main content, the hateful nicknames employed, have brought it about that no one quotes from Evers to-day if he wishes to be taken seriously. Then, little more than a decade later (1904), came the effort of the Dominician, Heinrich Denifle. This work by such an eminent scholar thoroughly acquainted with the Middle Ages, has given decided stimulus to recent research concerning Luther. [Vide LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. xxxix, p. 251 sqq.] Denifle did not live to complete his work but the second volume was finished by the inferior hand of his fellow-Dominican, Albert Maria Weiss. The theme of this work is Luther the renegade who has fallen away from his order because of his own moral depravity. Denifle's biography has given Protestant historians no little concern, and they have not yet made an end of all the problems calling for solution. But the labored inartistic disposition of the work, its open passion, its coarse style, and above all its intemperate polemics, have branded it as highly unsatisfactory, as a scientific work.

None of these three works fully answers the demand for a respectable dignified biography of Luther from the Catholic representatives of historical science.

That Denifle does not satisfy the Catholic camp is manifest in the quick appearance of this new work of Grisar and its success on the market. And as a matter of fact Grisar shows a very different temper and employs a very different style from that of his predecessors. He claims to stand with both feet upon the platform of unhampered scientific investigation. He says he recognizes it as a necessary principle in historical research that the religious convictions of the author dare never lead him to misinterpret the sources or to distort the inflexible facts of the

past. He declares that it is his earnest desire to promote "respect and love between the confessions." This all promises well.

One of the first features of the new biography to fix the attention of the reader is the clearing away of the many fables and myths which the Papists have attached to Luther's life. It is refreshing to read these concessions. Has Catholic science really come to the confessional? A few items will serve as examples. The beautiful incident in Luther's boyhood in Eisenach, when he found a kindly home in the house of Frau Cotta, is no longer distorted into an ugly scandal. Frau Cotta is recognized by Grisar as an estimable old lady of benign disposition and her house as highly respected and well-to-do. Grisar also clears away another foolish fiction which has long persisted in Catholic literature and which maliciously interjects a scandal into Luther's life as a young monk in Erfurt. The false documentary evidence with which this fiction was buttressed is exposed to daylight, and "the respect which Luther enjoyed" is held to prove it impossible.

With equal candor and merit does Grisar oppose the Catholic custom of representing Luther's attack upon indulgences as the outgrowth of Augustinian hatred and envy against the Dominicans. Grisar claims that Luther's jealousy of the Dominicans afterwards poured oil on the fire, but admits that it was by no means the first cause of the conflagration. Superficial and biased is the habit so common among all Catholics since 1517, of claiming that if Luther or an Augustianian had received the Papal commission which Tetzel the Dominican received, there would have been no Reformer. The bias of this view is finally admitted. Grisar devotes one whole section to what he calls "the Wartburg Legends" and takes occasion among other things, to remove another scandal which Catholics have imposed upon Luther's stay in the castle there. Moreover, with reference to Luther's marriage, an event which has always played such a large part in Romish interpretations of Luther's life and work, Grisar's position marks an advance. He asserts, of course, that according to canonical law (and therefore imperial law) no marriage can be valid between a monk and a nun who have broken their monastic vows, but he frankly admits that all the formalities of a legal marriage were properly observed in Luther's case

and stoutly defends the honor of Luther and Catherine against the libel and vaunting calumny of the gossips.

These few instances will serve to indicate how Grisar breaks with the past of Catholic representations concerning Luther and how he refuses credence to the favorite fictions of the Papists. But just this feature we must regard as one of the dangerous elements in this new portrait. The false perspective is more difficult to detect. For by this sort of criticism and concession Grisar awakens in his uncritical reader a high degree of confidence in his scientific accuracy and large respect for his historical objectivity. The reader who is not acquainted with the sources feels inclined therefore to entrust himself to Grisar's fairmindedness and to accept perforce all that is said to Luther's discredit, and this is by far the larger part of the work.

Here again a few examples. The cooling of Luther's monastic ardor and the decline of his religious zeal takes its beginning from his trip to Rome in 1510. Luther was very unscrupulous, says Grisar, in selecting his company in Rome and for that reason took offense at the Holy City. He passed by the Stairs of Pilate for reasons of convenience. He neglected most of his religious duties in Rome and thus began the ebb of his piety. But the real beginning of Luther's alienation from the Church and the Pope came when the Pope refused to grant Luther's request that he be allowed to lay aside monastic garb and to remain in Italy for ten years to study. This refusal so offended Luther's sense of honor that he never fully recovered his friendly feelings for Rome and when later the controversy on indulgences became a practical matter Luther found it quite easy to rise in protest against the Pope and his offensive authority. This is indeed quite a novel theory concerning the real beginning of Luther's alienation from Rome and reminds us strongly of Duke George's charge that Luther revolted because the Pope would not make him bishop or cardinal.

Scholars have busied themselves a great deal during the last decade with the problem of Luther's development to his complete break with Rome. (Incidentally be it remarked, this entire question of Luther's inner development has received new light by the discovery two years ago of Luther's lectures on Romans and has recently been made the subject of an able comprehensive discussion by Professor Otto Scheel of Tübingen in his

plastic little work, *Die Entwicklung Luthers bis zum Abschluss der Vorlesung über den Römerbrief* in the twenty-seventh volume of the *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*). It is a well known fact that Catholic scholars have sought the key to an understanding of Luther's gradual fall from grace in his own physical immorality. By a sensuous interpretation of Luther's *concupiscentia,* by distorting his doctrine *de servo arbitrio,* and by misinterpreting his own personal confessions and expressions of humility, the conclusion to his ethical depravity was made quite plausible. Grisar does us the favor of dropping this method of procedure and admitting that Luther's primary motive among others was religious. But our joy is not complete, for Grisar takes very frequent opportunity to arouse in his reader's mind the strongest suspicions concerning Luther's ethical integrity. This he does sometimes by direct statement, more often by implications and suggested inferences which leave little remaining of his professed historical objectivity and his "spirit of reconciliation." These accusations can not even be indicated here. Many of them are recounted and energetically and conclusively refuted in Kawerau's *Luther in kathloscher Beleuchtung,* 1911. There is little comfort in the apologies which Grisar offers for Luther's transgressions.

We have seen how Grisar explains the beginning of Luther's changed attitude through his experience in Rome.. This decline of his religious zeal prepared for his complete break in 1519. The once loyal and devoted Augustinian gradually cools in his piety and in his love for the Church. The whirl of work and distractions, the intemperate participation in social functions and convivialities, leave no time for the exercise of the practical Christian virtues. Utterly devoid of intellectual and moral discipline, filled with the spirit of opposition, a stranger to meditation, repentance, and humility, and with a knowledge of the needs of practical religion, the piqued monk slowly gravitates away from the Church towards the court of Frederick the Wise until in 1519 he severs the last cord that binds him to salvation. His greatest fault is, of course, his intellectual pride. This is the one ready explanation that the Catholic Church monotonously employs to account for heresy. And this she does consistently. It is only natural that variations from the prescribed teachings of an infallible Church should be ascribed to

intellectual pride. Critics of dogmatic traditions never escape that verdict without receiving a worse one. It is one of the tragedies of individuality that the person who sees problems which others can not see, who has experiences which others do not have, and who confidently defends as true what his entire generation regards as false, must be led to the cross and ridiculed for his vaunting pride. And when Martin Luther goes down into the ditch and begins with his own hands to dig up the infallible Church of the Middle Ages the kindliest explanation possible for those within the edifice is to ascribe his unpleasant operations to his "pride of spirit." This kindliest explanation Grisar graciously employs. It is perhaps the mildest verdict that Luther has yet received from a correct Papist, and we do well to recognize Grisar's honesty of purpose and the improvement he has made upon his antecedents in this matter. Whether his assertions that Martin Luther was a stranger to practical piety and to humility can be maintained in the light of the facts, is not for us here to investigate.

In general it will be admitted that Grisar's biography marks an advance upon those of Janssen, Evers, and Denifle. But the fact that Grisar in spite of his great learning, his wide knowledg of the literature on his subject, and his mainfest honesty of effort, should have failed in all essential points to bring an adequate reproduction of Luther's life, leads us to ask whether we may ever hope for a satisfactory Luther biography from a Catholic pen. We have highly meritorious Catholic works on Calvin, as witness those of Kampschulte and Cornelius. But let us recall that Kampschulte and Cornelius were not theologians but profane historians in the full enjoyment of academic freedom. Moreover, in Calvin's work the matter of chief concern is to explain the complex interaction of the political situation and the ecclesiastical relations, while in the biography of Luther the chief task is to portray his religious personality and his inner development. It is true, very orthodox Catholics often manifest a kindly attitude toward Protestants. But let us recall that the kindly attitude towards present-day Protestants is officially based upon our "ignorantia invincibilis" and is by no means extended to one who has been in the real Church and has fallen away. Now Luther is in Catholic eyes not only an apostate from grace but the very chief of heretics who led thousands

to perdition and himself died under the ban of the Holy Church. Is it possible that with such prepossessions adequately, *i. e.*, scientifically, to portray Luther's religious development as Reformer? No, the dogma directs the pen and therefore hinders the free course of scientific presentation. The verdict has fallen before the investigation has begun. The religious division in the sixteenth century was due either to a fault in the Church or to a fault in Martin Luther. But for the Papist the Church can have no fault. Therefore the Catholic biographer must portray Luther's fault. He dare not agree with him; he can not understand him. And we may never hope for an adequate biography of Luther from Catholic pen.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Missionary Heroes of the Lutheran Church. By L. B. Wolf, D.D. 60 cents paper, 75 cents cloth, net.

The heroes here presented are, almost without exception, so familiar to our pastors and people that we may name them without initials or titles, Ziegenbalg, Schwartz, Heyer, Officer, Harpster, Rowe, Day and Kinsinger. Two of the sketches are by the Editor, Rev. L. B. Wolf, D.D., himself a missionary for twenty-four years, one of the succession to the pioneer Heyer, a co-worker with Harpster, while the others are by such well known writers as John Aberly, D.D., Charles E. Hay, D.D., W. W. Criley, D.D., Jacob A. Clutz, D.D., George Scholl, D.D., and the Rev. E. G. Howard. Six of these subjects gained right to a place in this volume by their labors in India, while the other two Officer and Day, won the same distinction by their connection with the Muhlenberg Mission. It would not be well to make comparison between these men. They differed in natural endowments; some of them were pioneers, others were followers; some of them gave the service of a long life, while others fell in their places, and it is sad to write it even now, when they had only begun to get their tasks in hand. In these, and other particulars they differed, while in worthy Christian character, in high ideal, in unfaltering, unselfish devotion, they stand upon the same high plane, entitled to equal honor and loving commemoration.

We have named these presentation, *sketches,* and that is what they are. The limited space did not permit complete biographies. Yet the material has been so carefully selected and so compactly presented, that we get a recognizable portrait of each individual, and a fair understanding of his place and part in his chosen work. Of course, each author evinces appreciation of his subject, yet each one has written with moderation. There is no painting in strong, exaggerated colors.

In two brief introductory essays the Editor traces the beginnings of distinctively foreign missionary work in the Lutheran Church, first, in the fatherland from 1555 to 1800, and secondly, in our own General Synod beginning with 1820. These two essays, together with statistics of India Lutheran missions, and Dr. Lenker's tables of Evangelical Lutheran Missionary Societies in the world, give much additional information.

The volume is heartily commended, particularly to all Lutherans. It is filled with information which many of them greatly need. We could wish that every pastor might secure a copy, kindle to a brighter flame the missionary fire in his own heart, and then urgently commend it to his people. World evangelization challenges Christianity now as in no preceding period since St. Paul felt and responded to its mighty pull, and if we are to do our part in this stupendous enterprise then we must buy and earnestly study such books as this.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

EATON AND MAINS. NEW YORK.

Theory and Practice of Foreign Missions. By James M. Buckley. Price 75 cents net.

Growth of the Missionary Concept. By John F. Goucher. Price 75 cents.

These two volumes, from the same publishers, having to do with the same subject, and spoken before the same institution, may fittingly be joined in this brief notice.

What impels the Christian Church to this gigantic work, the evangelization of the world? This question is important, and it is wholly relevant. The answers given are various, though usually resolvable. Dr. Buckley rests this cause upon three pillars, philanthropy, recompense, and the commands and prayers of Christ. Of these three chief arguments the third is regarded as primary, and hence receives fullest treatment. The belief that such of the heathen as are true to the light which they have will be ultimately reckoned among the saved, is presented as a subsidary argument. Next is given some account of the actual conduct of this work, including such matters as methods of organization, conditions of success, financial and administrative problems, selection and qualification of missionaries, whether they should be married or not, how to deal with non-Christian peoples, the work of women's societies, and so forth. A comparison between the circumstances favorable and unfavorable to present mission work, leads to the conclusion that while difficulties will be encountered in the prosecution of this task, and reverses and delays, the outcome is not uncertain. The victory of the Cross of Jesus Christ is sure. The fourth and concluding lecture deals with the present and the future of foreign missions, and sounds the same confident note of enthusiasm and hope.

In the second volume the subject is the same, but the approach, and consequently the treatment, are different. Dr.

Goucher works more from within. He proceeds after the fashion of the preacher, and we get his text in the first sentence, "Christ alone can save this world, but Christ can't save this world, alone." Two propositions are deduced thus: (1) the problem is God's—not forced upon him but undertaken by him according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord, and (2) in the solution of this problem of human salvation God has limited himself to human co-operation. This is the philosophy of missions. Apprehension of these primary truths will shape our view of this problem, determine our practical attitude toward it, and give the measure of our co-operation therein. If, for example, we study this problem only superficially, fix attention only upon the difficulties in the way, why then the solution of the problem will seem to us *impossible;* a little stronger faith, and a little deeper study of the problem, may modify this conclusion, and the solution may seem only *improbable;* if it be remembered that Christ has determined to work through human agents, then it is seen that our co-operation is *imperative;* and if Christ has assumed the world's salvation as his special mission then his relation to the task is *indispensable,* and it is the guarantee that the solution of the problem is *inevitable*...The words in italics indicate the point of view from which the subject is presented in the successive lectures. In the unfolding large use is made of Scripture, and some of the interpretations are striking. Illustrations gathered from different mission fields, but chiefly from China, are employed with good effect.

Dr. Buckley and Dr. Goucher are both men of great ability, and wide and varied scholarship. They are acknowledged leaders in the great denomination to which they belong. Their ample qualification for the task to which they were invited by the Syracuse University will not be questioned by any. We are glad that in the midst of many labors they have had time and strength for these earnest and forceful discussions, the result in each case of many years of thought and experience, upon this great and urgent theme, the evangelization of the world.

LUTHER KUHLMAN.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS C. NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Bible and Modern Life. By Clayton Sedgwick Cooper. 12mo. Cloth. 16 full page half-tone illustrations. 224 pp. Price $1.00 net.

Mr. Cooper, the author of this book, is International Secretary for Bible Study under the auspices of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations. He is

widely known as a Bible student, and as a speaker on Bible study and a leader of thoughtful men. His special work has been the organization of Bible Departments, Conventions, Institutes, and Systems for the training of Bible students. He was himself the teacher for four years, of an organized Church Bible Class numbering 500 men. In all this work he has had great success. He is prepared, therefore, to speak with authority on the subjects discussed in this volume. These subjects are, Why Men Study the Bible; The College Man, the Church and the Bible; Bible Study among Men in the Orient; Successful Organization and Conduct of Bible Study; Bible Study in Small Classes; Large Organized Bible Classes; Bible Study Courses and Literature; and The Bible as a Means to Service. There is also a lengthy Appendix containing programs for Bible Institutes and Conferences and Organized Bible Classes, and also a model Constitution and By-Laws for large organized classes of men. There is also an extended bibliography of reference literature.

In view of the great interest now taken in organized Bible Classes, and especially in men's classes, this book is especially timely. We cordially commend it to all who are interested in this line of work.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

AMERICAN LUTHERAN PUBLICATION BOARD. PITTSBURGH.

The Way of Life, or Why Should You be a Christian and a Church Member? By G. Luecke. Pp. 96. 6 1-2 x 4 in. Price 30 cents. $3.00 and express per doz. $23.00 and express per hundred.

This little hand-book contains a very clear and convincing presentation of the fundamental truths of the Bible and of the Christian religion. It is especially adapted to be put in the hands of young people, or older men and women, who may be tempted by doubts, or who may be hesitating about committing themselves to the Christian life or making a public profession of their faith by uniting with the Church.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Lebensbilder ans der Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche für Lutherische Leser Nordamerikas ausgewählt und bearbeitet von E. A. Wilhelm Krausz, Professor am Concordia-Seminar zu St. Louis, Mo. Cloth. Red edges. Size 7 1-2 x 10. Pp. viii, 800.

This handsome volume ought to find a welcome in many German homes. It is written in a flowing style and illustrated with numerous excellent cuts and reproductions in *fac simile* of historical documents of great value. The contents of the volume embrace brief descriptions of the epochs of the history of the Church from the age of the apostles to the present day.

The appendix concerning "the Lutheran Church of North America" contains three chapters treating respectively of Muhlenberg, Walther and Wyneken. Apart from the biographical sketches of these men the treatment of the Lutheran Church in America is utterly inadequate.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GENERAL COUNCIL PUBLICATION BOARD. PHILADELPHIA.

The Book of Concord or The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, edited by Dr. Henry Eyster Jacobs, Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. Flexible cloth. Pp. 758. Price postpaid $1.50.

The Book of Concord is a treasure house of Christian doctrine as confessed by the Lutheran Church. No Lutheran minister is worthy of the name without owning and using this book. Only two American translations of it have been made, the older one by the Henkels of New Market, Va., and the latter by Dr. Jacobs in 1882. The present edition, called "the people's edition," is a reproduction of one of the two larger volumes of Dr. Jacobs' work, and is identical in contents and type with it, except in substituting a more recent translation of the Augsburg Confession for the former one, and in making various minor changes. There are analyses of the several books, and a complete index of subjects. The reduced price and the convenient and attractive make-up ought to be a sufficient inducement to ministers, theological students and intelligent laymen to purchase this invaluable volume.

To attempt to define its contents in this notice would be to endeavor to write on a single page the history of the Lutheran Church and the development of her doctrines. A perusal of this book will strengthen faith and stimulate devotion to the truth. We congratulate the author that he has been providentially permitted to give the Church this new edition; and also the Board which has done the mechanical work so well.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Inner Mission. A Handbook for Christian Workers. By the Rev. J. F. Ohl, Mns.D., Superintendent of the Philadelphia City Mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Pp. 253. Price $1.00.

The term "Inner Missions," has long been a familiar one in Germany. It is only within the past decade or so that it has come into general use in this country even among Lutherans. Especially is this true of English speaking Lutherans. Even now it is probable that comparatively few of our English speaking Lutherans understand the real meaning of "Inner Missions," or the extent of the work that is being done among us. The reason for this is that much of the work is carried on in the German and Scandinavian tongues, and that the work is divided between some twenty or more different Lutheran synods, or general bodies, most of which have little or no fraternal relations with each other.

The whole Church owes a debt of gratitude. therefore, to Dr. Ohl for this excellent volume, which for the first time presents, at least in English. the character. the history and the vast extent of Lutheran Inner Mission Work, both in this country and abroad.

In a brief introduction the meaning of the term and the character of the work are clearly defined. Then follows a "Preliminary History of the Inner Mission" in the early Church. in the Mediaeval Church, and in the Reformation Era and Beyond. Next the Inner Mission in its Modern Form is discussed in a chapter covering about fifty pages.

Part II deals with the various "Forms of Inner Mission Activity." The chapter headings in this part of the discussion will give an illuminating view of the character and extent of the work included under Inner Missions. They are I. The Propagation of the Gospel: II. The Care and Training of Children: III. The Training and Preservation of Young People; IV, The Protection of the Imperiled; V, The Saving of the Lost; VI, The Care of the Sick and Defective; VII, The Conflict with Social Ills.

It will be seen from this list that there is hardly any form of Christian or benevolent work known to the Church which is not included. It will be seen also how much wider and richer the term Inner Missions is than that of Home Missions with which it is often confounded among our English speaking people..

Dr. Ohl's presentation of the subject is most interesting, instructive and inspiring. His book cannot but stimulate a much wider and deeper interest in this work among our Lutheran churches, and a much more intelligent and liberal support of it.

The book is enriched by numerous illustrations and has at the close two appendixes giving many valuable statictics and a list

of all the Lutheran Inner Missions Institutions in the United States. There is also a very suggestive and helpful bibliography and an excellent index.

We most cordially commend the reading and study of this volume to our ministers and laymen, and especially to those, of whom we fear there are not a few, who have been disposed to think that the Lutheran Church is behind other denominations in works of charity and mercy.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

Commentary on the Book of Job, by George A. Barton, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College. Cloth, 5 x 6 1-2. Pp. xi, 321. Price 90 cents net.

The author in his introduction takes an extremely radical view as to the integrity of the Book of Job. He holds that "the prologue and epilogue belonged to an old folk tale and that there once stood between them a description of Job's demeanor under suffering different from that which we now find there." Moreover it is the author's judgment that the Elihu speeches and various other portions are interpolations. These criticisms would indicate serious mutilations, which to our mind are far from being demonstrated. The comments on the text are rich and suggestive. They are brief but clear.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Basal Belief of Christianity, by James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D., author of "Scenes and Sayings in the Life of Christ," etc Cloth, 8 mo. Pp. ix, 252.

In thirty short chapters the author sets forth the great truths involved in the Christian faith concerning God, Man, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Christian Life, and Last Things. The presentation is popular rather than profound. The style is simple and clear. The book shows how great things can be made plain by a writer who understands his subject and knows how to use language. Pastors will be glad to have such a volume to hand to doubters and to earnest Christian teachers who may want simple and strong arguments in defense of the faith.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

Harriet Beecher Stowe, The Story of Her Life, by her son, Charles Edward Stowe, and her grandson, Lyman Beecher Stowe. Cloth. Pp. 313. Price $1.50 net.

Harriet Beecher Stowe was born a hundred years ago, June 14, 1811. A daughter of the celebrated Lyman Beecher and a sister of the more illustrious son, Henry Ward Beecher, Harriet belongs to the immortals. Her one distinguished achievement, the writing of Uncle Tom's Cabin, gave her a unique place in the history of the United States. Her work is always mentioned as a factor in hastening the crisis of the slavery agitation which culminated in the Civil War and the abolition of slavery.

The volume before us is "The story of a real character; telling, not so much what she did as what she was, and how she became what she was." There is no attempt at eulogy. The facts of her life are told with appreciation. We see her as she was from her childhood in the New England home of a poor pastor, through her busy life of service, down to her beautiful death. We see her mental struggles in arriving at the full assurance of faith through the mists of Calvinism, her trials as an author amid family cares, and her association with great men are a part of the story. Whittier, Holmes, Lincoln, "George Eliot," Greely, John Bright, Mrs. Browning, Fields, Hawthorne, Frederick Douglas, Sojourner Truth, Garrison, and many other rare characters were her friends. She lived in a religious and theological atmosphere and was familiar with the deep problems of the schools. Her father was a professor at Lane, and her husband a professor at Andover Seminary. Mrs. Stowe was a noble woman, with enough foibles in her make-up to remind us that she was very human.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GINN AND COMPANY. BOSTON.

Papers on Inter-Racial Problems communicated to the First Universal Races Congress, held at the University of London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited for the Congress Executive by G. Spiller, Hon. Organizer of the Congress. Cloth. Pp. xvi, 484. Price, postpaid, $2.40.

The Universal Races Congress held in London, July 26-29, 1911, was the most important conference ever held upon the mutual relations and duties of various races and peoples. It can only be compared with the great Parliament of Religions at Chicago in 1893, which in another but a related field marked an epoch. The London Races Congress has focused the mind of the world upon the necessity of mutual respect, good understanding, and real co-operation between the different races of men. Lord Weardale, the president of the congress, properly viewed it as an event in the great movement for international justice and peace; for the wars of our time spring repeatedly

from racial antagonisms and misunderstandings and the exploitation of weaker peoples by stronger. It is therefore fittting that the American edition of the proceedings of this notable congress should be published by the World Peace Foundation in Boston; and the volume will be read as eagerly by the members of the peace societies and the Mohonk Conferences as by the members of the Indian Rights Association and the Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The large volume of more than five hundred pages contains not only all the papers presented to the congress, but a complete list of the officers of the congress and the hundreds of persons in all countries (there are nearly two hundred from the United States alone) who were interested in its promotion.

The object of the congress was the discussion, in the light of science and the modern conscience, the general relations between the peoples of the West and the East, between white and colored people, with a view to encouraging, between them a fuller understanding, the most friendly feelings, and a heartier co-operation. Many distinguished scholars of various races and from many lands contributed papers on anthropological subjects. Naturally very large claims were made for their respective races by the authors. The general trend of the papers confirm the proposition of the editor that "there is no fair proof of some races being substantially superior to others in inborn capacity, and hence our moral standard need never to be modified." The congress emphasizes the scientific truth long ago proclaimed by Paul to the proud Athenians that God "made of one every nation of men"—a truth as old as Genesis.

The papers are able and interesting and will do something to promote tolerance and brotherhood. They are a repository of facts concerning human conditions. This volume is a real addition to the study of mankind from many view-points.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The Eisenach Gospel Selections Made Ready for Pulpit Work. Volume II. First Sunday after Trinity to Thanksgiving. By Rev. R. C. H. Lenski. Pp. 451.

This volume consists of a series of expositions of the Eisenach Gospel Lessons for the twenty-eight Sundays of The Trinity Cycle, and also for the Reformation Festival, and Thanksgiving or the Harvest Home Festival. Each exposition is followed by a page or more of "Homiletical Hints" and a series of sermonic outlines, some of them translated or adapted from leading German divines, but the majority of them apparently the author's own work.

The expositions are quite full and are simple, natural and thoroughly evangelical. The homiletical hints are fresh, striking and suggestive. The sermonic outlines are generally constructed after the German type. If properly used, this volume will be very helpful to pastors especially in expository preaching which is at once the most difficult and the most instructive and helpful method of preaching, if well done.

If the book had been given a "Table of Contents," and a textual or topical Index, or both, it would have added very greatly to its value for general use. The paper, binding and typographical work are of very superior quality.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS CO. NEW YORK.

The Homiletic Review, Oct. 1911, is up to its usual high standard as a preachers' magazine in all the various departments which belong their domain. Topics of a homiletic, pastoral, social and reformatory character are ably discussed.

The Missionary Review of the World, Oct. 1911, sustains its reputation as the most comprehensive and able missionary publication in our language. In its general survey of the mission fields of the world it is unexcelled. Many of its articles are illustrated.

The Literary Digest is an almost indispensable weekly visitor to the busy man. It gives him much in little and from all sides —social, political, industrial, scientific, literary and religious.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

PAMPHLETS.

Eucharist or the Lord's Supper. By Carl A. E. Stohlmann. Octavo, pp. 32. The purpose is to establish the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, that "the Sacrament of the Altar is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given unto us Christians to eat and to drink, as it was instituted by Christ Himself." Published in English and German by the author. Erie, Pa.

The End of Darwinism. An essay by Alfred P. Schultz, M.D., pp. 17. Published by the author, Monticello, Sullivan Co., N. Y.

In this essay the claim is made that "Not change but persistence is characteristic of life. Every change is essentially a per-

sistence. Only what persists can change. In religion the theory of evolution is atheistic; everything else is a faint-treated compromise. A God that sits so far off as the theory demands is no God."

The Religious Possibilities of the Motion Picture. By Herbert A. Jump, Minister of the South Congregational Church, New Britain, Conn. Printed for private distribution.

The Ideal College President. By Charles W. Super.

Rome vs. America. By D. A. Sommer. (Seventh thousand), pp. 42. Price 20 cents, 3 for 50 cents.

The first edition of this tract was issued with the title, "Letters to Roosevelt on Romanism." This edition is revised and greatly enlarged. Published by the Octographic Review, Indianapolis, Ind.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching —its Aims and Tendency. By Rev. Timothy Brosuahan, S.J. Pp. 40.

This essay is issued from 1651 East Main St., Columbus, O., as the Catholic Educational Association Bulletin for August, 1911. It is a severe arraignment of the Carnegie Foundation, and especially of the way in which it is being administered by Mr. Pritchett and the Board of Trustees of which he is the executive head.

Sir Edward Grey on Union for the World Peace; List of Arbitration Treaties, Compiled by Denys P. Myers; Syndicates for War, or the Influence of the Makers of War Material and of Capital Invested in War Supplies; and *The Grange and Peace,* the Report of the Committee on International Peace adopted by the National Grange at its Annual Convention, 1909. All published and circulated by The World Peace Foundation, 29 A Beacon Street, Boston.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

TERMS -$2.50 a year, in advance. 75 cents per copy

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D. FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D
JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLI—NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1911.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.
COMPILER PRINT
1911

CONTENTS.

I. THE CHURCH AND THE TOILER..... 1

BY EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

II. THE ANTITHESIS OF ROMANISM AND LUTHERANISM 15

BY REV. ARTHUR H. SMITH, D.D.

III. DR. ELIOT'S "RELIGION OF THE FUTURE"..... 30

BY ADAM STUMP, D.D.

IV. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE DEPARTED SOULS.. 53

BY REV. FRED. S. GEESEY.

V. GLIMPSES OF EARLY LUTHERAN THEOLOGY..... 61

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D.

VI. THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SACRAMENTS 74

BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.

VII. THE LUTHERAN USAGE OF LENT..... 84

BY E. E. ORTLEPP, D.D.

VIII. CHARGE TO PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.....117

BY JACOB HENRY CULLER, D.D.

THE FORMULATION OF THE GENERAL SYNOD'S CONFESSIONAL BASIS 120

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

IX. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT 140

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M.

X. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.....152

The Person of Christ—The Word for God in Chinese—The Science of Poetry and the Philosophy of Language—Logic and Imagination in the Perception of Truth—The Development of Religion—The Religions of Eastern Asia—The Eisenach Gospel Selections—Lutheran Annual 1911—Beitrage zur pracktischen Behandlung der Biblischen Geschichte—World Missionary Conference 1910—The Song of Songs—Social Ministry—The Lesson Handbook 1911—The Political Theories of Martin Luther—Problems of Your Generation—National Perils and Hopes—World Corporation—Catacombs of Worldly Success or History of Coarseller Dell.

Books Which Every Lutheran Should Read

The Lutheran Monograph Series

A new series of timely booklets for popular reading at popular prices.

The Distinctive Doctrines of Lutheranism

By A. G. VOIGT, D. D.

Our doctrines are stated so clearly and simply that they can be grasped by every reader. It is a valuable contribution to the understanding of Lutheran doctrines.

Present Day Lutheranism

By F. P. MANHART, D. D.

Anyone who wishes to understand the actual situation in the Lutheran Church to-day as regards doctrine, polity and synodical organizations will find it all here in a nut shell.

Is the Ministry an Attractive Vocation?

By DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

A new edition of this stimulating booklet as a number of the Lutheran Monograph Series. It may now be secured at *a great reduction* in price.

The Miracles of Christ

By the late MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.

This monograph is a reprint of Dr Valentine's lucid and powerful discussion of the nature, the place, the proof and the evidential value of miracles in an argument for Christianity, which was contained in Volume I. of his "Christian Theology." Many who cannot possess the larger work will welcome this masterly extract.

Single copies, 5 cents; 50 cents a dozen, net.

The Nature of God

By JOHN A. HALL, D. D.

These chapters are given as the answer of Christian faith to the inquiry, "What is God?" They show the failure of philosophy adequately to answer that inquiry. The author insists upon the divine revelation of Scripture. Many illuminating paragraphs set forth the deep things sometimes hard to understand. One lays down the book with quickened pulses and ardent faith.

$1.25 net, postpaid

The Post-Apostolic Age and Current Religious Problems

By J. B. REMENSNYDER, D. D., LL. D.

Modern progress has cleared up many things, but it has not shaken the central pillars of Christianity. The book contains a general discussion of the time succeeding the apostolic age, and the doctrines taught, and finds that primitive and modern Christianity are essentially the same.—*The Advance.*

The author has read many authorities on the subjects he discusses and his book abounds in valuable quotations. He writes in pleasing style, and the reader will receive many helpful suggestions from the comparison of the doctrines and usages of the time following the Apostles and those of the Protestant period. In this respect the work is unique, and an original contribution to modern apologetic literature.—*G. W. Richards, D. D., in the Reformed Church Review.*

$1.25 net, postpaid

The Lutheran Catechist

By G. H. GERBERDING, D. D.

This volume has a legitimate place without crowding upon others, for the literature of catechetics in English is not extensive. Doctor Gerberding writes out of his experiences as a pastor for nearly twenty years and as a teacher of prospective preachers for nearly as long a period. The book has been prepared with scholarly thoroughness and with practical ends ever in view. It shows wide reading on the literature of the subject, and will confirm the Lutheran Church in the wisdom of its catechetical practices.—*The Lutheran Observer.*

$1.50 net, postpaid

SEND US YOUR ORDER FOR ANY BOOK ON THE MARKET

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1424 Arch Street, Philadelphia

P. 2. 2987. 2.